Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-232
Tuesday
5 December 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-232 *5 December 1989*

CONTENTS

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Meeting of Warsaw Pact Leaders in Moscow Reported 1
CSSR's Urbanek, Johanes, Adamec Arrive *[Prague Radio]* 1
Shevardnadze Meets Polish Leaders *[Warsaw Radio]* 1
Meeting Opens 4 Dec *[TASS]* 1
Gorbachev Briefing on Malta Meeting *[PRAVDA 5 Dec]* 1
1968 Invasion of CSSR Condemned *[Moscow TV]* 2
Hungary's Nyers Comments *[Budapest MTI]* 2
Ryzhkov, GDR's Modrow Discuss Ties *[TASS]* 3
Gorbachev Assures Modrow of Support *[TASS]* 3
Gorbachev, CSSR Leaders Discuss Troops *[TASS]* 3
CSSR 'Domestic' Situation Discussed *[PRAVDA 5 Dec]* 4
Shevardnadze, Johanes on Soviet Troops *[TASS]* 4
Gorbachev, Ceausescu Hold 'Frank' Talks *[PRAVDA 5 Dec]* 4
Seen as 'Comradely', 'Open Exchange' *[Bucharest AGERPRES]* 4
Ryzhkov, MSZP's Nemeth on Economic Ties *[PRAVDA 5 Dec]* 5
Further on Ryzhkov-Nemeth Talks *[Budapest Radio]* 5
Gorbachev, Hungary's Nyers To Meet Soon *[Budapest MTI]* 5
Poland's Mazowiecki Views Pact Meeting *[Warsaw PAP]* 5
Jaruzelski Praises Malta Meeting *[Warsaw PAP]* 6
Polish Delegation Returns to Warsaw *[TASS]* 6

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Bush Comments on Talks in Brussels *[TASS]* 7
Further Reportage on Bush-Gorbachev Malta Meeting 7
Moscow TV on 3 Dec News Conference 7
Baker on Meeting, Forces' Discussion *[TASS]* 14
IZVESTIYA Cites U.S. Reactions *[5 Dec]* 14
Gerasimov Terms Meeting 'Turning Point' *[Budapest Radio]* 15
IZVESTIYA Sums Up Meeting *[5 Dec]* 15
TV Discussants View Talks *[Moscow International]* 17
Academician Views Results *[Tokyo TV]* 19
Further Zhurkin Interview *[Tokyo TV]* 21
Comparison of Gorbachev-Adami Meeting *[PRAVDA 3 Dec]* 21
Jurist Comments on Baltic Role in Soviet-U.S. Ties *[Riga International]* 22

China

USSR-PRC Exchanges in November Reviewed *[Moscow International]* 22
China, USSR Establish 'First' Joint Venture *[Harbin Radio]* 23
Sino-Soviet Joint Venture Set for Beijing *[Moscow International]* 23
Heilongjiang Delegation Ends Visit to Leningrad *[Moscow International]* 24

Northeast Asia

Kornilov on Relations With South Korea *[TASS]* 24
KCNA Cited on Polish-South Korean Ties *[TRUD 10 Nov]* 24
New South Korean Rightist Group Examined *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 30 Nov]* 25

Southeast Asia & Pacific

48 Soviet Nationals 'In Danger' in Manila *[Moscow International]* 25
Manila Situation, U.S. Involvement Viewed *[PRAVDA 4 Dec]* 25
U.S. Claimed Reneging on Philippine Bases Payment
[Aleksandrov on Moscow International] 26
Philippine Case Against Westinghouse Analyzed *[Alexandrov on Moscow International]* 27

Near East & South Asia

Israeli Land Reclamation Raises Interest at Fair *[Jerusalem Radio]* 27
Commentary on Mid-Term Majlis Elections in Iran *[Andreyev on Moscow International]* ... 27
Human Rights Committee Invited to Tehran *[Andreyev on Moscow International]* 28
Need for Persian Gulf Cooperation Stressed *[Radio Peace and Progress]* 29
Moscow Views Results of OPEC Conference *[Batyev on Moscow International]* 29
Supreme Soviet Delegation Departs Syria *[TASS]* 30
Returns to Moscow *[TASS]* 30
USSR, PDRY Exchange Greetings *[TASS]* 31
Ministers Congratulate Indian Premier *[PRAVDA 4 Dec]* 31

Sub-Saharan Africa

Angola Protests U.S. Senators' Letter to Bush *[PRAVDA 30 Nov]* 31
Commentator on Coup Attempt in Comoros *[(Gregoriy) on Moscow International]* 31
Yuliy Vorontsov Receives Ethiopian Envoy *[IZVESTIYA 29 Nov]* 32
CPSU Delegation Leaves for Cape Verde *[PRAVDA 24 Nov]* 32

East Europe

Poland's Rakowski Meets Yakovlev in Moscow *[TASS]* 32
Meets Hungary's Nemeth *[Warsaw PAP]* 32
Poland's Siwicki Visits, Meets Leaders 33
Meets With Yazov *[TASS]* 33
Received by Zaykov *[TASS]* 33
Poland's Economic Future Remains in Doubt *[TRUD 25 Nov]* 33
Polish Deserters, Pacifists Pressure Sejm Deputies
[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 3 Dec] 34
CPSU Delegation Studies Polish Education *[PRAVDA 3 Dec]* 35
SED Central Committee Acknowledges Criticism *[PRAVDA 4 Dec]* 35
Commission To Guide SED, Prepare for Congress *[TASS]* 36
TASS Views GDR Human Chains, Protests 36
'Crisis of State and Party Power' in GDR *[TASS]* 36
Tensions Rising in CSSR Over New Cabinet *[TASS]* 37
Movie on 1968 Invasion of CSSR Premiered *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 5 Dec]* 37
Hungary Reduces Armed Forces, Military Service *[IZVESTIYA 3 Dec]* 37
Hungary's Grosz Discusses MSZMP Congress *[TASS]* 38
BCP's Overview of Public Contacts Noted *[PRAVDA 29 Nov]* 38
Deputy Premier Laverov at SFRY Envoy's Reception *[PRAVDA 30 Nov]* 38
Yakovlev Says E. Europe Events Not Destabilizing *[Budapest TV]* 39

West Europe

FRG Foreign Minister Genscher Begins Visit 39
Arrives, Met by Shevardnadze *[TASS]* 39
Visit Signifies Important Stage in Ties *[TASS]* 39
Genscher Cited on EC Ties With East Europe
[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 25 Nov] 39
Deputy Premier Silayev in FRG, Meets Leaders 40
Received by Weizsaecker *[IZVESTIYA 4 Dec]* 40
Expresses Condolences on Bombing *[PRAVDA 2 Dec]* 40
Visit Summarized *[PRAVDA 4 Dec]* 40

Slyunkov Confers With FRG Businessman *[PRAVDA 25 Nov]* 41
FRG's Rau on Outcome of Moscow Talks *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 25 Nov]* 41
FRG Envoy Brings Genscher Letter for Shevardnadze *[IZVESTIYA 29 Nov]* 41
CPSU, SPD Academics Confer on Social Ideas *[PRAVDA 16 Nov]* 41
Gorbachev Meets San Marino Communist Head 24 Nov *[Moscow Radio]* 42
Comparison of Gorbachev Milan News Conference *[PRAVDA 3 Dec]* 42
Comparison of Pope John Paul II Speech *[PRAVDA 2 Dec]* 43
Shevardnadze Cited on Europe, Afghan Situation *[Rome LA REPUBBLICA 1 Dec]* 43
Reportage on Yeltsin Visit to Greece 45
Gives News Conference in Athens *[AFP]* 45
Meets Greek Leaders *[TASS]* 45
General Staff's Omelichev on Swedish Lecture Tour *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 26 Nov]* 46
Baltic Capitals Get Direct Air Link to Sweden *[IZVESTIYA 27 Nov]* 46
CPSU Greets British Communist Congress *[PRAVDA 25 Nov]* 46
Congress Ends 28 Nov *[PRAVDA 29 Nov]* 46
Girenko Pays Last Respects to Spain's Ibarruri *[PRAVDA 17 Nov]* 47

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Railroad Traffic Resumes in Azerbaijan *[Baku Radio]* 48
Azeris Attack Armenian Militia Post *[ARMENPRES]* 48
NKAO Rally Supports Reunification Decision *[Yerevan Radio]* 48
Resolution on Armenia-NKAO Unity Published *[Yerevan International]* 48
Comments on Supreme Soviet Decision on NKAO 49
Armenian Supreme Court Justice *[Yerevan International]* 49
Armenian Press Criticism *[Yerevan International]* 50
Azerbaijani Praise *[Baku Radio]* 51
Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet Commissions Meet *[Baku Radio]* 51
Azerbaijan Leaders Meet With Baku Workers *[Baku Radio]* 51
Armenian Supreme Soviet Agenda Noted *[Yerevan Radio]* 52
Armenian Exclusion From Formulating Draft Hit *[Yerevan International]* 52
Draft Armenian National Movement Program *[KOMSOMOLETS 4 Nov]* 53
Armenian Economic Performance Evaluated *[Yerevan International]* 55
Crimes by Armenian 'Extremists' Claimed *[Baku Radio]* 56
Baku Investigation of Armenians Completed *[Baku Radio]* 57
Fire Damages Georgian Oil Refinery; No Casualties *[TASS]* 57
Commentary on Lithuanian Communist Party Plenum *[Vilnius International]* 57
Medvedev Confers With Lithuanian Communists *[Vilnius International]* 58
Meets With Intelligentsia *[Vilnius Radio]* 59
Medvedev Visit Analyzed *[Butkus on Vilnius International]* 59
Degtyarev Meets Lithuanian Opposition Parties *[Vilnius Radio]* 60
Estonian Draft Budget Described *[TASS]* 60
Estonian Secretary on Medvedev, Yakovlev Talks *[Tallinn Radio]* 61
Election Loss Predicted for Latvian Communists *[TASS]* 62
'Heat' of Campaign 'Intensifiying' *[PRAVDA 3 Dec]* 62
Army Daily on Latvian Supreme Soviet Session *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 16 Nov]* 63
Latvian People's Front Status After 2d Congress *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 17 Oct]* 65
Ryzhkov Report on 13th 5-year Plan Summarized *[Moscow TV]* 68
Report on RSFSR Supreme Soviet Session *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 29 Nov]* 68
Trade Union Plenum Discusses Strike Issue *[TASS]* 69
RSFSR Trade Union Council Tasks Detailed *[TRUD 15 Nov]* 70
Ukraine Primate's Statement on Legalizing Church *[Vatican International]* 71
Uniate Church Registration Not Legalization *[Kiev International]* 71
PRAVDA Reports on Ukrainian Party Plenum *[2 Dec]* 72
Ukrainian Plenum Approves Election Platform *[Kiev International]* 73
New Election Commission Described *[PRAVDA UKRAINY 14 Nov]* 74
Ukrainian SSR Election Schedule Published *[PRAVDA UKRAINY 1 Nov]* 75
Ukrainian SSR Election Committee Created *[PRAVDA UKRAINY 1 Nov]* 75
Ukrainian SSR Proposes Election Experiment *[PRAVDA UKRAINY 1 Nov]* 77

Baku Enterprises End Strike 4 Dec *[IZVESTIYA 5 Dec]* 77
5-Point Earthquake Registered in Kirghizia *[TASS]* 77
Transport Vehicles Banned From Moscow *[Moscow Radio]* 77
Moscow First Secretary, Others Interviewed *[PRAVDA 27 Nov]* 77
Problems of Moscow Party, Soviets Examined *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 47]* 81
Zaykov Visits Automobile Factory *[VECHERNYAYA MOSKVA 1 Nov]* 84
Slyunkov Speaks at Scientific, Engineering Plenum *[PRAVDA 22 Nov]* 85
Further on Address *[TASS]* 88
KGB Official on Protecting State Secrets *[PRAVITELSTVENNYY VESTNIK No 22]* 88
KGB Press Group on Subversion on Afghan Border *[TASS]* 91
Two Die As Freight Trains Collide Near Murmansk *[PRAVDA 30 Nov]* 91
Moldavian Communists Discuss 'Acute' Problems *[TASS]* 91
Former Trade Minister Patolichev Dies *[TASS]* 92

Economic

Statistical Yearbook for 1988 Economy Published *[TASS]* 92
Ecology Committee's Draft Law on Property *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 21 Nov]* 92
Deputy Minister Explains Export Licenses *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 16 Nov]* 94
Readers Debate Merits of Private Ownership *[IZVESTIYA 28 Nov]* 96
Food Product Quality Worsens, Prices Rise *[TRUD 22 Nov]* 98
Hasty Dismantling of Central Control Criticized
[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 10 Nov] 100
Donbass: Implementation of Resolution 608
[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 19 Nov] 102

Agricultural

Gorbachev Talk at Agricultural Meeting Viewed *[PRAVDA 27 Nov]* 105

Scientific

Kvant-2-Mir Docking Set for 6 Dec *[Moscow International]* 106
Large Communications Satellites Proposed *[IZVESTIYA 16 Nov]* 107
Problems Facing Satellite Program Viewed *[PRAVDA 13 Nov]* 108

Military

'Balanced' Approach to Test Range Urged *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 29 Nov]* 110
Plane Crash Highlights Shortage of Survival Gear *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 30 Nov]* 111
Defense Industries Continue Conversion *[Moscow International]* 112
Problem of Draft Dodging Considered *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 28 Nov]* 112
Zaykov, Yazov Speak at Veterans' Collegium *[Moscow Radio]* 115
Akhromeyev on Military Doctrine, Arms Control *[ZA RUBEZHOM No 46]* 115
Chervov Interviewed on Defense Sufficiency *[TRUD 24 Nov]* 118
IZVESTIYA Interviews Military Censor *[IZVESTIYA 27 Nov]* 120
Defense Society Alters Name To Reflect Change *[Moscow Radio]* 122
Leaders Sign Obituary of Retired Gen Agafonov *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 29 Nov]* 122

Meeting of Warsaw Pact Leaders in Moscow Reported

CSSR's Urbanek, Johanes, Adamec Arrive

LD0312215389 Prague Domestic Service in Slovak 2100 GMT 3 Dec 89

[Text] Federal Premier Ladislav Adamec arrived in Moscow today. Arriving there with him were Minister of Foreign Affairs Jaromir Johanes; Karel Urbanek, general secretary of the CPCZ [Czechoslovak Communist Party] Central Committee; and Ondrej Saling, member of the Presidium and secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee.

They are in Moscow to attend a meeting of leaders of the Warsaw Pact states, at which Mikhail Gorbachev will brief them on the outcome of his talks with George Bush.

Shevardnadze Meets Polish Leaders

LD0412134489 Warsaw Domestic Service in Polish 1300 GMT 4 Dec 89

[Text] President Wojciech Jaruzelski, Premier Tadeusz Mazowiecki, and Foreign Minister Krzysztof Skubiszewski have arrived in Moscow for a meeting of the Warsaw Pact members' heads of state. The Polish delegation was welcomed at Vnukovo Airport by the Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze.

Meeting Opens 4 Dec

LD0412132989 Moscow TASS in English 1317 GMT 4 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 4 TASS—The Warsaw Treaty heads of state began their meeting in Moscow today. The meeting is attended by the delegations of: Bulgaria—led by Bulgarian Communist Party leader Petr Mladenov, of Hungary—led by Hungarian Socialist Party Chairman Rezso Nyers, the German Democratic Republic—led by President of the State Council Egon Krenz, Poland—led by President Wojciech Jaruzelski, Romania—led by Romanian Communist Party chief, President Nicolae Ceausescu, the USSR—led by President Mikhail Gorbachev and Czechoslovakia—led by Czechoslovak Communist Party leader Karel Urbanek.

Mikhail Gorbachev will inform the representatives of the allied countries on the results of his talks with U.S. President George Bush.

Gorbachev Briefing on Malta Meeting

PM0512100389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Dec 89 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Moscow Meeting"]

[Text] An information meeting of Warsaw Pact leaders was held in Moscow 4 December 1989. M.S. Gorbachev presented to the leaders of the allied countries detailed information about his conversations with U.S. President George Bush, held on 2 and 3 December. On the eve of the meeting in Malta, he noted, we consulted our allies in writing and we agreed that during examination of the situation in the world and in Europe, both as a whole and in the Eastern part of the continent, we would proceed from positions agreed upon with them. It is this that the Soviet side was guided by during the informal exchange of views with the U.S. President concerning a broad range of pressing issues of the international situation.

The talks with George Bush demonstrated that the new political thinking yields results. They confirmed the necessity and, what is the main thing, the possibility of linkage of interests of states, regardless of their political and social systems.

The atmosphere of frankness and impartiality [nepredvzyatost] which established itself from the very start of the meeting made it possible to carry out a constructive exchange of views on practically all major international problems of the present time and to examine the main questions of bilateral Soviet-U.S. relations.

Considerable place was given to various component parts of the process of changes taking place in Eastern Europe, a process that is exerting a profound and multifaceted influence upon the trends in European and world developments.

Both sides pointed to the importance of safeguarding stability, which would not only instill a feeling of security and confidence in all European states without exception, but would also guarantee a future [Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1800 GMT on 4 December in its "Vremya" program carries a report on the meeting, which at this point adds the following: "upon the basis of a balance of interests"] for the emergent and therefore still precarious European structures.

Assessing the prospects for development of relations along the East-West line, with account being taken of the changes taking place in both parts of the European Continent, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev singled out the importance of a further lowering of the levels of military confrontation, of respecting the state borders existing in Europe. Realism compels one to proceed from the premise that the alliances that have taken shape—the NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization—will be preserved in the foreseeable future.

However, they can make a contribution of their own to strengthening European security precisely as political alliances, having become a bridge upon the basis of a high and joint responsibility.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev also described the results of his visit to Italy and the conversations with the Italian leadership, as well as the meeting in the Vatican with Pope John Paul II.

Comrades Mladenov, Nyers, Modrow, Jaruzelski, Ceausescu and Urbanek made short statements at the meeting.

[Moscow TV at this point adds: "Comrades Mladenov, Nyers, Modrow, Jaruzelski, Ceausescu, and Urbanek appraised as positive the results of the latest round in the

Soviet-U.S. dialogue, emphasized the significance of constructive Soviet-U.S. relations, along with the significance of deepening cooperation among all European states for strengthening detente, for the final elimination of the last vestiges of the Cold War and for a transition toward a stable and peaceful period of development of mankind's civilization.

["The exchange of views has shown that the leaders of the Warsaw Pact member states consistently come out in favor of European reconstruction based on the principles of peace, good-neighborliness and respect for the interests of each member of the present international community. In this context, they expressed support for the policy of the GDR, its constructive efforts aimed at normalizing relations between both German states in accordance with the universally recognized legal norms."]

Concluding the meeting, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev emphasized the significance of close interaction and of renewing, in present-day conditions, of the forms and methods of the activities of the Warsaw Pact. This is demanded by a further development of the all- European process on the basis of a balance of interests of all the states on the continent.

Taking part in the meeting, which was held in a friendly atmosphere, were:

P. Mladenov, G. Atanasov, D. Stanishev, and B. Dimitrov from Bulgaria; R. Nyers, M. Nemeth, and F. Somogyi from Hungary; E. Krenz, H. Modrow, and O. Fischer from the GDR; W. Jaruzelski, T. Mazowiecki, M. Rakowski, and K. Skubiszewski from Poland; N. Ceausescu, C. Dascalescu, C. Olteanu, and I. Stoian from Romania; M.S. Gorbachev, N.I. Ryzhkov, E.A. Shevardnadze, and A.N. Yakovlev from the USSR; and K. Urbanek, L. Adamec, O. Saling, and J. Johanes from the CSSR.

1968 Invasion of CSSR Condemned

LD0412182689 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 4 Dec 89

[From the "Vremya" neswcast]

[Text] The leaders of Bulgaria, Hungary, GDR, Poland, and the Soviet Union met in Moscow today and declared that the introduction of their states' troops into the CSSR was interference in the internal affairs of sovereign Czechoslovakia and must be condemned.

Having interrupted the process of the democratic renewal of the CSSR, these illegal actions had long-lasting negative results.

History has confirmed how important it is, even in the most complex international situation, to use political means to settle any problems, to strictly observe the principles of sovereignty, independence, and noninterference in internal affairs in relations between states, wich is in accordance with the tenets of the Warsaw Pact.

Here is the statement by the Soviet Government:

Czechoslovak society is at a stage of critical reinterpretation of the experience of its political and economic development, a natural process through which many countries pass in one way or another. Unfortunately, the necessity for constant socialist self- renewal and realistic evaluations of the events that are taking place have not always been a matter of course, especially in a situation where such events were interwoven in a contradictory way, and bold responses were demanded to the challenge of the times.

In 1968, the Soviet leadership adopted the position of one side in the internal debate in Czechoslovakia around tasks that had objectively come to a head. The justification for such an unbalanced and inadequate approach, for interference in the affairs of a friendly country was seen at that time in the sharp confrontation of East and West.

We share the opinion of the Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee Presidium and the CSSR Government that the entry of the armies of five socialist countries into Czechoslovakia in 1968 was not well founded, and the decision to do so, in light of all the facts now known, was erroneous.

Hungary's Nyers Comments

LD0412222189 Budapest MTI in English 2150 GMT 4 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow, December 4 (MTI)—On the proposal of Mikhail Gorbachev, the leaders of the Warsaw Treaty member states held on Monday a brief consultation on the 1968 military intervention in Czechoslovakia. The parties agreed that the intervention was an error and violated the basic principles of the Warsaw Treaty, Rezso Nyers told Hungarian journalists in Moscow Monday evening.

The president of the Hungarian Socialist Party added that the Brezhnev Doctrine was no longer a matter of debate within the Warsaw Treaty. The member states unanimously rejected it.

Mr Nyers said he had raised the fact there were deep economic crises behind the current political crises in Eastern Europe. Since the member states are unable to get out of them with mere political solutions, they have to entirely transform the system of economic relations in the East European region. Mr Nyers urged the acceleration of reform of the Warsaw Treaty. This is necessitated by both the changes occurring at breathtaking speed in the majority of member states and the contacts between the blocs.

Mr Nyers said that the Romanian contribution reflected anxiety over the internal situation and policy of some member states of the Warsaw Treaty.

Mikhail Gorbachev informed the leaders of the Warsaw Treaty member states on the Malta summit that paid particular attention to the European issues and East European changes. The Soviet and U.S. positions on the two German states are not diametrically opposed, Mr Gorbachev said. The parties to the summit agreed that

reunification was a justified but at present untimely endeavour of the German people. Close cooperation between the two German states might be a practical solution to the German issue, he said.

As reported earlier, Budapest's Ferihegy Airport is closed to all traffic because of the thick fog. The Hungarian delegation is therefore expected to return from Moscow on Tuesday.

Ryzhkov, GDR's Modrow Discuss Ties

LD0412144289 Moscow TASS in English 1428 GMT 4 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 4 TASS—Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov met his German Democratic Republic counterpart Hans Modrow today.

Hans Modrow arrived in Moscow in connection with a meeting of heads of Warsaw Treaty member-countries.

The two prime ministers exchanged information about the course of the processes of socialist renewal in the Soviet Union and the German Democratic Republic. They positively appraised the prospects for equal and mutually advantageous cooperation between the two countries, which will be perfected in accordance with new conditions of their social and economic development.

When international affairs were discussed, the two prime ministers emphasised their countries' adherence to the further development of the European process. They both stressed their readiness to expand mutually avantageous good-neighourly cooperation between the countries on the basis of unconditional respect for existing political and territorial realities and for the purposes of consolidating international peace and security.

Gorbachev Assures Modrow of Support

LD0412175589 Moscow TASS in English 1742 GMT 4 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 4 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev had a conversation with Hans Modrow, prime minister of the German Democratic Republic, today.

Modrow noted the extreme complexity of the situation in the German Democratic Republic and emphasised the striving of the GDR coalition government for the quest of the ways out of the crisis in accordance with the aspirations of the people.

Modrow noted that the Socialist Unity Party of Germany is preparing for an extraordinary congress which is to form the leadership capable of restoring the party's prestige as one of the main forces of social progress in the German Democratic Republic.

Gorbachev said that the Soviet people regard the German Democratic Republic as a reliable friend and ally, an important guarantor of peace and stability in Europe.

"The Socialist Unity Party of Germany, our German friends can always count on solidarity and support of the Soviet Communist Party, of the entire Soviet people," Gorbachev said.

He wished communists of the German Democratic Republic success in the preparation for the forthcoming congress.

[Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1800 GMT on 4 December adds the following: "Egon Krenz, chairman of the GDR State Council, and GDR Foreign Minister Oskar Fischer took part in the conversation."]

Gorbachev, CSSR Leaders Discuss Troops

LD0412193689 Moscow TASS in English 1924 GMT 4 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 4 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev conversed today with general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia Karel Urbanek, and chairman of the Czechoslovak Government Adamec.

During the discussion of relations between the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia it was emphasised that they are based on profound long-term factors.

The peoples of the two countries are interested in the development of equal and mutually advantageous cooperation and political interaction.

Allied ties of the two countries play a substantial role in the maintenance of stability and inviolability of postwar frontiers in Europe and in the successful development of all-European process.

It was noted that the Soviet Communist Party and the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia take an identical view of the bringing of troops of five Warsaw Treaty countries in Czechoslovak territory in 1968. That action was interference in Czechoslovakia's internal affairs incompatible with norms of relations between sovereign countries.

The question of the terms on which Soviet troops stay in Czechoslovakia came up for discussion. It was decided to analyse it at consultations of appropriate state departments of the two countries.

Reduction of armed forces and armaments on condition of maintaining European balance and ensuring equal security and inviolability of the frontiers of all European countries, including, naturally, the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia, is the indispensable guarantee of stability in Europe, of the development of the Helsinki process, in the successful development of which all its participants are interested.

The sides expressed the striving to strengthen cooperation between the Soviet Communist Party and the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia to exchange experience in party work and deepen mutual understanding on most topical problems of contemporary world development.

CSSR 'Domestic' Situation Discussed

PM0512114589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Dec 89 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "M.S. Gorbachev Meets With K. Urbanek and L. Adamec"]

[Excerpts] On 4 December Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev met Czechoslovak Communist Party [CPCZ] General Secretary Urbanek and CSSR Premier Adamec. The Czechoslovak comrades spoke about the domestic political situation in their country, which is undergoing turbulent changes. The aspiration of workers and young people for an acceleration of perestroyka, for the democratization of the political structure, and for the renewal of society predominates. The forces that are pushing the country beyond the socialist choice are also becoming active. The new CPCZ leadership proceeds from the need to resolutely rid itself of conservatism and act as a force for renewal in alliance with everyone to whom the values of socialism and democracy are dear.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stressed the need for communists to take into account in a timely manner the urgent requirements for a renewal of public life. However contradictory the processes unfolding in many European socialist countries may look, they have been engendered by requirements for profound changes and for a breakthrough to the heights set by contemporary civilization. The socialist idea is not dying, as some people try to assert, but it is growing new shoots, displaying its viability in numerous forms by overcoming difficulties. [passage omitted covered by preceding item LD0412193689]

The mutual aspiration was expressed to strengthen cooperation between the CPSU and the CPCZ in the interests of a businesslike exchange of the experience of party work and to deepen mutual understanding on the most topical problems of contemporary world development. The processes of perestroyka, democracy, and renewal of society, processes which are dynamically developing in our countries, represent a substantial stimulus for such cooperation.

The conversation took place in an atmosphere of mutual understanding, frankness, and comradeship. Comrades Ryzhkov, Shevardnadze, and Yakovlev participated.

Shevardnadze, Johanes on Soviet Troops

LD0412153689 Moscow TASS in English 1515 GMT 4 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 4 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and his Czechoslovak counterpart Jaromir Johanes today discussed some aspects of bilateral relations.

The discussion was held at the Soviet Foreign Ministry at the Czechoslovak official's request.

In connection with the issue related to the temporary stay of Soviet troops on Czechoslovak territory, raised by the Czechoslovak side, it was decided to start corresponding bilateral consultations on the basis of the understanding that the solution of this issue should be linked to the current process of disarmament in Europe.

Gorbachev, Ceausescu Hold 'Frank' Talks

PM0512114789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Dec 89 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "M.S. Gorbachev Meets With N. Ceausescu"]

[Text] Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev met 4 December President of the Romanian Socialist Republic Nicolae Ceausescu, who is also general secretary of the Romanian Communist Party Central Committee.

The sides presented their views on the pressing issues of socialist construction, the development of the communist and worker's movement, as well as the present world situation.

A meaningful discussion of aspects of the development of mutually beneficial economic cooperation, pooling the efforts of the two countries in production, science and technology took place.

The sides emphasized their mutual interest in deepening cooperation between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Socialist Republic of Romania in the humanitarian and foreign political fields.

The conversation was held in a comradely atmosphere and in the spirit of a frank exchange of opinions. N.I. Ryzhkov and Romanian Prime Minister C. Dascalescu took part in it.

Seen as 'Comradely', 'Open Exchange'

AU0512091389 Bucharest AGERPRES in English 2211 GMT 4 Dec 89

["Interview Between Nicolae Ceausescu and M.S.Gorbachev" —AGERPRES headline]

[Text] Bucharest, AGERPRES, 4/12/1989—On December 4, Nicolae Ceausescu, general secretary of the RCP [Romanian Communist Party], president of Romania, met with M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CC [Central Committee] president of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

During their interview, the two party and state leaders informed each other of the course of socialist construction in Romania and the Soviet Union. Satisfaction was expressed at the traditional links of friendship and collaboration between the two parties, countries and peoples and so was the mutual wish to further work for their expansion and development of multiple planes, in the interest of socialist construction in the two countries, of the general cause of socialism, co laboration and peace in the world. Nicolae Ceausescu and M.S. Gorbachev exchanged opinions on current questions related to socialist construction and the international communist and working-class movement, as well as on issues of the international life.

Emphasis was placed on the mutual interest in expanding the collaboration between Romania and the Soviet Union both bilaterally and in the international life.

The interview was attended by Constantin Dascalescu, prime minister of Romania, and N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR.

The interview occasioned an open exchange of opinions and passed in a comradely atmosphere.

Ryzhkov, MSZP's Nemeth on Economic Ties

PM0512115189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Dec 89 Second Edition p 4

["Talks in the Kremlin"—PRAVDA headline]

[Text] Nikolay Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, exchanged opinions on a series of issues relating to the development of Soviet-Hungarian relations with Miklos Nemeth, member of the Presidium of the MSZP [Hungarian Socialist Party] and chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Hungarian Republic 4 December. The latter was taking part in the meeting of leaders of Warsaw Pact member states in Moscow.

The main focus was on the discussion of topical problems of further improving economic, scientific, and technical cooperation between the two countries. The necessity of linking the mechanism of bilateral cooperation with the economic reforms being carried out in the USSR and in Hungary was pointed out in principle. Restructuring of such a mechanism towards bringing it closer to the conditions of the world market, and creating possibilities for transferring to accounts in freely convertible currency on the basis of world prices would create the prerequisites for qualitative advances in further activization of trade and economic ties. It was agreed that the relevant departments of the two countries would continue working through specific cooperation issues, and would draw up proposals for their implementation.

Issues relating to balancing bilateral trade turnover were also discussed, as were the opportunities for expanding direct ties between enterprises and organizations of the Soviet Union and Hungary, and for increasing the volumes of border trade.

Taking part in the talks, which were held in a businesslike and friendly atmosphere, were V.K. Gusev and S.A. Sitaryan, deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers, and F. Somogyi, secretary of state at the Hungarian Foreign Ministry.

Further on Ryzhkov-Nemeth Talks

LD0412185389 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 1730 GMT 4 Dec 89

[Report by Gabor Izbeki from Moscow]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] Rezso Nyers has promised to brief the Hungarian press about the Warsaw Pact summit. However, because of the length of the meeting underway in Lenin Hills, this has been postponed for the time being.

This morning there was an unofficial discussion between the Hungarian and Soviet heads of governments. Here Miklos Nemeth handed over to Nikolai Ryzhkov concrete proposals relating to the transformation of the two countries' economic relations.

The Hungarian prime minister stated that our country is interested in developing full-scale market and business relations based on world market values. Our country would also like the Soviet Union to renounce a proportion of the unilateral advantages stemming from the transition to dollar accounting, and to shoulder some of the disadantages affecting us.

Prime Minister Ryzhkov showed understanding for the fact that our country has urged the precise observation of the agreement relating to energy and vehicle deliveries, and making up for the delivery backlogs.

The discussion between the Hungarian and Soviet heads of government was not too public, since prime minister Ryzhkov was only able to receive the Hungarian premier, and not others. Thus, at the Soviet's request, not even photographers were allowed into the discussion chamber.

Gorbachev, Hungary's Nyers To Meet Soon

LD0412221189 Budapest MTI in English 2052 GMT 4 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow, December 4 (MTI)—Rezso Nyers and Mikhail Gorbachev agreed to meet again in the not-too-distant future, during the visit to Moscow of the HSP [Hungarian Socialist Party] president, Istvan Degen, head of the Office of the HSP President, told the Moscow correspondent of MTI on Monday.

Mr Nyers headed a Hungarian Socialist Workers Party delegation to Moscow last summer. After the October congress, the CPSU Central committee general secretary greeted him on the occasion of his election as HSP president. Mr Nyers has now completed his first visit to Moscow in his present capacity and the date of his next visit is to be coordinated later, Mr Degen said.

Poland's Mazowiecki Views Pact Meeting

LD0412215589 Warsaw PAP in English 2139 GMT 4 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow, Dec. 4—Polish Prime Minister Tadeusz Mazowiecki granted an interview to PAP in connection with Monday's meeting of leaders of states—parties to the Warsaw Treaty. Excerpts:

"The meeting's agenda included Mikhail Gorbachev's detailed report on, first, talks in Italy, a meeting with Pope John Paul II and, second, talks with President George Bush. I must stress here that the report's part devoted to the talk with the pope was very interesting and showed Mikhail Gorbachev's high respect for John

Paul II. Mr Gorbachev put a great emphasis on the fact that it had been a very, very interesting meeting for him.

"As regards talks with President Bush, Mikhail Gorbachev presented some issues in a more detailed way. It was a sort of a review of world problems. Issues which concerned a possible progress in disarmament talks in the next six months are worth mentioning. In my opinion this is very important.

"A significant element of the meeting was the adoption of a statement by leaders of Bulgaria, the GDR, Poland, Hungary and the Soviet Union which condemned the 1968 intervention in Czechoslovakia. I am glad that this could take place at the firs' meeting of the Warsaw Treaty states' leaders in which I had an opportunity to participate."

Jaruzelski Praises Malta Meeting

LD0412215989 Warsaw PAP in English 2126 GMT 4 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow, Dec. 4—Poland's President Wojciech Jaruzelski said in an interview for PAP following the Moscow summit of Warsaw Treaty states:

This summit, like the previous ones, was primarily devoted to an assessment of the international situation. It once again showed our concordance in approach, in assessment of the situation, in politics—in its general terms. The policy and stance adopted by Mikhail Gorbachev has won full approval among us as being in line with the foreign policy of states of the Warsaw Treaty.

It is true that the participants (in the meeting) were different to a large extent—the leaderships have changed in many countries. Of course we were aware that our foreign policy is being pursued in new conditions, in a period of changes taking place today in nearly all socialist countries.

Owing to its history, location and problems and tasks tackled by us today and to deep reforms and transformations, Poland is particularly interested in the process of dialogue, rapprochement between the two parts of Europe and a general rapprochement on the global scale taking palce as fast and fully as possible. We can implement our national aspirations only in these conditions.

Because the Malta summit constitutes a certain step on the road to rapprochement between the superpowers, it also sets up a certain plane for a peaceful policy of all European countries belonging to the two blocs. Hence, it is very advantageous for Poland and that is why we have expressed full support for its outcome. We are counting on it bearing fruit soon, at the next summit, in the form of far-reaching disarmament steps.

This is of particular significance for us. Our initiatives, our disarmament plan is a part of these global solutions. We are also very active in the Vienna negotiations and I think that at present we are getting additional impetus for these negotiations to end in success. I am not referring to economic aspects because they are obvious. The broader and deeper East-West cooperation is in the political sphere, the more fruitful the efforts in economic cooperation can be, and these we need very much.

Polish Delegation Returns to Warsaw

LD0512075189 Moscow TASS in English 0736 GMT 5 Dec 89

[Text] Warsaw December 5 TASS—The Polish delegation returned late on Monday here from Moscow, where it attended the information meeting of the leaders of Warsaw Treaty member states.

The meeting, like the previous ones, primarily dealt with the assessment of the international situation, Polish President Wojciech Jaruzelski told the news agency PAP. It demonstrated unanimity in approaches, in the assessment of the situation and in general policy issues. Mikhail Gorbachev's policy and position were completely supported as being in line with the Warsaw Treaty foreign policy, conducted in new conditions, at a time of changes that take place today in nearly all the socialist countries, he noted.

The Malta meeting between Gorbachev and U.S. President George Bush went some way towards bringing closer together the two superpowers. It also paves the way for the peace policy of all the European countries, members of the two blocs. Thus the results of that meeting meet the interests of Poland, the Polish president said. Poland expressed complete support for its results and believes that they will bear fruit very soon at the next summit meeting in the form of advanced disarmament measures and give additional impetus for the success of the Vienna talks. All this is of great significance for Poland.

The more extensive is East-West cooperation in the political field, the more effective are efforts to strengthen economic cooperation, Jaruzelski said.

Polish Prime Minister Tadeusz Mazowiecki described as an important element of the Moscow meeting the signing of the statement by heads of Bulgaria, Hungary, the German Democratic Republic, Poland and the Soviet Union, which denounced the 1968 invasion of Czechoslovakia.

"I am glad that this happened at the first meeting of leaders of Warsaw Treaty States, in which I took part," he said.

United States & Canada

Bush Comments on Talks in Brussels

LD0412235989 Moscow TASS in English 2346 GMT 4 Dec 89

[Text] Brussels December 5 TASS—President George Bush held a news conference in Brussels on Monday to sum up the results of his meeting with Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and his consultations with the heads of state and government of the U.S. NATO allied countries.

Bush described the "climate for the discussions" with the Soviet leader as "very good" and their conversation "very friendly".

"I'm convinced he is determined to do what he told me he was doing—reform, perestroyka. Openness—we totally agree on is a democratic value," Bush said. [punctuation as received]

"I think we just feel more comfortable about our common objectives", he added.

"We put forward some general themes on the economy. And I think he was pleased, because...he now sees that we want to have a cooperative, forward-leaning relationship with the Soviet Union.

"There is a tremendous potential for the Soviet Union that is in accord with us on these democratic values. It's a tremendous market, for example, but it needs the economic reform.

"And then there is just enormous potential for living at peace with that tremendous power."

Responding to one of the questions, the U.S. President said that he saw no chance of dissolving NATO in the foreseeable future and added that he pledged in Brussels that the United States would "maintain significant military forces in Europe, as long as our allies desire our presence as part of common defence effort".

"This year, the people of the East made fundamental choices about their destiny and governments there began to honor the citizens' right to choose. What these changes amount to is nothing less than a peaceful revolution. And the task before us, therefore, is to consolidate the fruits of this peaceful revolution and provide the architecture for continued peaceful change," President Bush said.

Further Reportage on Bush-Gorbachev Malta Meeting

Moscow TV on 3 Dec News Conference

LD0412152689 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2015 GMT 3 Dec 89

[Statements to the press and news conference given by President George Bush and President Mikhail Gorbachev on 3 December in Malta; Bush remarks throughout and all questions denoted as being asked in English have Russian translation superimposed—recorded]

[Text] [Bush] Esteemed ladies and gentlemen. Mr Gorbachev has kindly given me the opportunity to speak first. I think you will all agree that the sea and the elements have involved us in some unforeseen adventure in this bay. First of all I would like to thank the prime minister and the people of Malta for their warm hospitality. I would like to thank the captain and the crew of the cruiser Belknap for the immense support which they have given to us all. Particular thanks to the captain and the crew of the motor-vessel Maksim Gorkiy for their great hospitality. We are also very grateful to the captain and crew of the cruiser Slava who have been very hospitable to the U.S. visitors who went there.

I discussed the possibility of this kind of unofficial meeting with President Gorbachev during my recent visit to Europe in July of this year. As a result of the changes in Poland and in other parts of Eastern Europe it would be useful to have a one-to-one talk, so to speak, with President Gorbachev. Such an opportunity has been given to us. Our relations have moved forward. President Gorbachev agreed and we agreed on this fairly quickly. All the great events that have taken place in Europe since the time this meeting was agreed have merely served to confirm the need for a meeting between us. Therefore I am particularly pleased that this meeting did take place. We now understand each other better and have created an opportunity for further progress on a broader circle of issues than earlier. Of course we are not tasked with the responsibility of determining the future of Europe or of other countries, but to some extent relations between the United States and the Soviet Union can play a very important role. I don't think there is any problem either in Europe or anywhere else which would not improve thanks to better relations between our two countries. This, as it were, should serve as a positive instrument influencing the changes in the world.

For 4 years [Russian translation as heard; Bush heard in English in background to say "40"] the Western allies have been working for peace. At the present our two countries. Each of the sides can make a contribution, its own contribution, to ensure that military confrontation ends in Europe and that violence and suffering in different parts of the world are reduced; that the lives of people and the environment are improved; that chemical weapons are destroyed, and that something is done in the struggle against the trade in drugs. In general that there should be considerable movement forward in these fields. We also have opportunities for interaction.

At the present time, the USSR has an interest in the market economy, and I absolutely wish to lend my support to these opportunities, both here in Malta, and in Brussels, when I meet our allies. I approach this very optimistically, I am in favor of cooperation with the Soviet Union and I hope for a lasting peace and for good relations between East and West. I want to have a hand

in the creation of this future and Mr Gorbachev and I have tried to do everything that is possible. I thank you for your cordial reception.

[Gorbachev] Esteemed ladies and gentlemen, and comrades: There are a great many symbols here in this meeting. The most recent one is that, in my opinion, there has been no case in history where the leaders of our two states have held a joint press conference. [Bush laughs]

This, too, is an important symbol. I share President Bush's opinion that we are in general pleased with the results of this meeting. We regard this meeting—an unofficial meeting; that is how it was conceived [Gorbachev changes thought] the idea belonged to President Bush, and I ardently supported it—to conduct such an unofficial meeting, not to restrict it to a previously established agenda, and to carry out a free exchange of opinions.

The times are making great demands on our countries. Naturally, this, above all, increased their responsibility and I assure you that in all the discussions—we have calculated that these discussions went on for a total of 8 hours—this responsibility was present on both sides.

Our meeting was marked by the good atmosphere, openness, and the scope of the exchange of opinions. Even now it is difficult, and perhaps it does not even make sense, to present you with a complete list of the problems which we discussed. Nevertheless, I want to say right away that on all the major problems, we attempted to present our positions in a frank form, with each side using arguments; and, both as far as the assessment of the situation and ongoing changes in the world and in Europe are concerned, and as far as disarmament problems are concerned—both as regards the negotiation process in Geneva and Vienna, and as regards the negotiations on developing a convention to prohibit chemical weapons—all these issues were discussed thoroughly.

The President and I considered it necessary to have an exchange of opinions on how we view the situation of the hot spots on the planet from Moscow and Washington, and this exchange was very substantive and constructive. We confirmed our previous positions according to which all these problems, acute problems, must be solved by political methods. I consider that this, too, was an important statement.

We did not simply discuss problems and set out our positions. It seems to me that on both sides there were many of the kinds of elements on which, if taken into account in the subsequent activity of the two governments, we can count on progress. And this applies to the subject of a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive weapons—and we made an optimistic assessment of the possibility of arriving at the conclusion of a treaty in Vienna as early as next year; moreover, we are both in favor of—and this is our position and we can naturally only answer for ourselves—this document being signed at the highest level.

This time we spoke a great deal about bilateral relations. For my part, I wish to note the numerous positive aspects and proposals which were contained in the utterances made on this score by President Bush. Thus, this is how I would put it: that as far as all the directions of our political dialogue and our discussions, including also our bilateral relations are concerned, we not only confirmed the consistency of the political line—and I must say this, because even though it is an unofficial meeting, it is our first meeting in this capacity with Mr Bush and the confirmation of continuity represents an important element—of no lesser importance, however, is the fact that already at this unofficial meeting we have, I think, created a certain reserve for this capital to gain in strength. As the President and I see it, it is, first and foremost, in the interests of our two countries and peoples and also in the interests of the whole world community.

All in all, contact has been established—a good contact. The atmosphere was friendly, direct, and open and this made it possible for us to carry out good work. The most dangerous thing in our position is to exaggerate. One must always, if you like, preserve elements of caution. I am here using the favorite word of Mr President Bush. [laughter] Our world and our relations are at a watershed stage. We must act very responsibly so that we are up to the challenge of the times. We cannot—and this is even more the case where leaders of such states are concerned—we cannot act as firemen would, although fire brigades do useful work and this must also be borne in mind, and this element was present.

Once again I wish to thank the President for the idea, for this meeting with which we are, I hope, pleased, and I wish to address to the people of Malta and to the Government of Malta words of gratitude for the hospitality that was shown. I thank you, Mr President, for your cooperation. [applause]

[Question] President Bush asked you to put an end to the cold war once and for all. Do you think that this (?has been) done?

[Gorbachev] First and foremost, I assured the U.S. President the Soviet Union will never start an actual war against the United States of America, and we want events and relations between our countries to develop in such a way that broader possibilities for cooperation might be provided. Naturally, the President and I discussed very broadly the problem of...[changes thought], sought the answer as to where we are now, to the question of where we are now. We both noted the world is passing from one age, that of the cold war, and entering a new age. True, so far this is still just a beginning, we are at the very beginning of the path of a lengthy period of peace. From this we drew the conclusion for ourselves—and we were unanimous in this—of the particular responsibility of such states as the United States of America and the Soviet Union. Naturally, we had quite a lengthy discussion, but it is not now for a news conference to be told about it, about how a new age demands new approaches, and that a lot of what was

created during the period of the cold war has to be resolutely abandoned—first and foremost gambling on force, confrontation, the arms' race, mistrust, and psychological and ideological skirmishes and struggles—all of that must become past history.

[Question in English] Mr Gorbachev, what are these hot spots you have been speaking about? Were you able to convince President Bush that the Soviet side will exert its influence upon Cuba and Nicaragua and that supplies of weapons to El Salvador will be ended?

[Gorbachev] Was that a question for me?

[Question] Yes, a question for you: Were you able to assure the President that the Soviet Union...

[Gorbachev—interrupting] This subject was discussed in detail. We confirmed yet again to the President that we have stopped and do not supply arms to Central America. We confirmed our position that we are sympathetic to the process, the political process which is underway their for a settlement of this situation. We favor free elections, with the participation of representatives of the United Nations and other Latin American states, determining the fate of Nicaragua. We understand the concern of the United States of America, and we have taken in the arguments of the President on this subject, but we assured him that we confirm in a principled way our principled policy for a political settlement concerning Central America.

It seems to me—and I do not want to now reveal everything that was said on this subject—but I will sum up and answer like this: there are possibilities for peace and calm to be installed in this region in the interests, first of all of the peoples of this region, which I think, does not run counter to the interests of the United States of America.

[Bush] My answer is as follows. We discussed all these questions seriously, as President Gorbachev has already said, and I will not be satisfied until all the hot spots have been eliminated and until peace comes as a result, so to speak, of verification. And indeed, with regard to all these regions I cannot assert that there are no differences between us, I cannot say that. There are differences, but they are getting narrower from the viewpoint of the United States and the Soviet Union: They are getting closer. Our concern surrounds the fact that there must be elections in Nicaragua and that there must be no supply of weapons there. We have spoken about this subject and I would say quite simply that I consider that we have now gotten much closer to an understanding of each other.

[Question] IZVESTIYA: A question for President Bush. And a commentary, perhaps, if there is one, from Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, and his assessment. The question of economic cooperation and of expanding economic cooperation between the Soviet Union and the United States has long been on the agenda. Currently it is more acute than at any other time before, both in light of the Soviet economic reforms and in light of the well-known economic difficulties we are experiencing. To what extent was this question discussed during your meeting? What is the position of your administration, Mr President, with regard to the question of expanding economic cooperation? Are you ready to encourage the American businessmen who show interest in working in the Soviet Union?

[Bush] We talked about this subject for quite a long time, precisely with regard to economic issues. We made a specific statement about how we can cooperate even more closely in the field of the economy with the Soviet Union. We also expressed ourselves earlier on this subject. I should just like to repeat once again that we are striving to create a climate of the kind in which U.S. businessmen will be able to help and assist in what Mr President Gorbachev is doing and trying to achieve with the help of glasnost and his reforms. As a result of these talks I have to say that what is happening in the Soviet Union and perhaps what we are able to do ourselves, for our own part, so that multilateral contacts with different organizations may also be established in the Soviet Union and in other countries in the Eastern bloc, I consider this very useful.

[Gorbachev] I want to comment on the President's reply to this question. First and foremost I reiterate what the President has said. Second, perhaps what has taken place at this meeting can be seen as a political impulse that was lacking to make our cooperation, economic cooperation, gather momentum and assume and acquire forms and scope commensurate both with our potential and the times. Naturally the future course of this process will depend considerably upon how the Soviet side will act and what economic and legal prerequisites are set up for this. You do know, however, we are currently preoccupied with this, so that the economy, the Soviet economy, is turned more resolutely toward ties and cooperation with other countries and so that it forms an organic part of the world economic system. So, we think and hope that what has taken place at this meeting and regarding this point on the agenda, so to put it, is of fundamental importance.

[Question] There is a very tense situation in Lebanon. Several voices are repeating the question about the sale or dispatch of weapons.

[Gorbachev] We could not avoid this Lebanese conflict because, as I understand it, both the Soviet people and the American people sympathize and perceive the pain, the difficulties, and the trials which have fallen to the lot of that people. We have shared information and our views on that count, our assessments. We agreed to maintain the exchange of opinion, each according to his possibilities. It seems to me that possibilities—it is true that President Bush considered that we possess more possibilities—but I considered we possess equal possibilities, to facilitate this conflict being favourably resolved.

[Bush] We support the agreement. We do not want even more people to be killed. Mr Gorbachev agrees with us,

and we are in complete agreement in this respect. The Lebanese issue was exhaustively discussed, and we are hoping for a peaceful, democratic Lebanon. Everyone in the United States sympathizes with [razdelyayet] with this conflagration, with these terrible disturbances taking place in Lebanon, and we are trying to everything possible to help.

[Question] A question for President Bush, from Gennadiy Vasilyev of PRAVDA. You are participating for the first time as President in a Soviet U.S. summit meeting, but you were vice president in the previous administration, so you participated in the formation of foreign policy. How do you see the path our two countries have traversed from Geneva to Malta?

[Bush] That is what we call a slowball in the trade. [laughter in the audience] It means it is an easy question, because I really think that things are considerably improving. The population is giving colossal support exactly to what Mr Gorbachev is doing within the country, within the Soviet Union. There is immense respect for Mr Gorbachev and his peaceful changes in Europe, and for this reason at this meeting we have achieved for which everything I was hoping. It was a meeting without an agenda, yet we nevertheless discussed a very great many subjects, as Mr Gorbachev has said. If relations can improve as a result of this meeting, then I believe this meeting has improved them.

[Question in English] Could you please say something about possible agendas of talks or agreements on nuclear arms, chemical arms, or conventional arms? What have you reached in this area?

[Gorbachev] Yes, you know, we devoted a lot of time to discussing concrete issues connected with talks on disarmament, on various kinds of arms. To illustrate that it was a substantive conversation, I want to say that a meeting between our foreign ministers, who have been instructed to carry out the necessary concrete work for bringing the positions closer, will take place already in the near future. In connection with the fact that the president has set forth new interesting proposals regarding chemical weapons, which have, which retain the goal of global ban and also stipulate certain elements, stages, and movements toward this global ban, an opportunity has opened to advance very quickly here.

Regarding strategic offensive weapons, an analysis of the situation here and the instructions given for preparing this agreement show that apparently we will be able, by the 2d half of June—and we have agreed to hold an official meeting at this time precisely—to carry out the necessary work and to harmonize the main provisions of the accord which could be later, in the next few months, be prepared for signing. So, I highly value what has taken place here in this direction. I can only say that there are such issues which will require, of course, a detailed discussion to remove anxieties from both sides.

Regarding our anxieties, they are primarily linked, concerning strategic offensive weapons and problems and the preparation of a treaty on their 50-percent reduction—these are sea-launched cruise missiles. On the whole, we raised the question with the President that when there is progress in all the areas of reducing nuclear arms and conventional weapons and troops, when we are going over to a defense doctrine, we, the Soviet Union, we voiced our interest that corresponding renovations should take place in the doctrines, in the military doctrines of NATO. We think that time has come when one should start speaking about the naval forces and should discuss this problem. On the whole, I would like only to confirm and the President...[corrects himself] to say and the President will confirm, I think, that these conversations were a very substantial ones, which, I hope, inspire us with hope and one can say that we can expect to succeed. [noise in the background can be heard]. Those were fireworks!

[Question] A question for President Gorbachev. President Gorbachev, tell me please, what is the reason for your caution? At the start of the talks the Soviet side was very optimistic in mood but now you have expressed a certain caution? What is the reason for this? Could it be said that your optimism was justified? This is for Portuguese television, please.

[Gorbachev] [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1730 GMT on 3 December, in an abridged recording of this interview, includes at this point the following remarks not carried in the 2015 GMT television recording: "I think that it was mainly about permission and optimism. Without going into the essential detail of your question, I would say..."] the gist of the question, if I have correctly understood it, boils down to what extent one can speak of optimism or pessimism on the results of this meeting. Or, perhaps I did not understand the question. It is hard to say. Is that it? Yes. You know, the fact that on the eve of this meeting we displayed restraint on both sides, care, again I would say caution, this did not by any means signify we were pessimists. I think this meant above all that we were responsible. Now that the meeting has taken place and now that I have already described the results to you briefly with the President, I can say I am optimistic in my appraisal both of these results and the prospects which they present. That is the dialectics.

[Question in English] Mr President Bush would you be so kind. President Gorbachev spoke on this question several minutes ago. Please, tell me, President Bush, your attitude toward NATO and the U.S. Navy. Do you think it right to consider cuts in this field?

[Bush] We tried to hammer out details. The President knows about that, I know about it. But the fact that we were able to very constructively discuss these questions, and the chairman knows that we cannot at present achieve complete progress in these fields, but we have spoken about the actual range of these questions, about naval arms control, Mr Gorbachev and I know that and we know that we have the possibility to discuss with our allies questions of disarmament. That is exactly the

climate and atmosphere of the meeting which I imagined and which Mr Gorbachev also imagined. We must in the course of the years discuss these divergences between our two countries and we have achieved this to a definite degree and will continuen to do so.

[Question in English] Did you discuss the Soviet proposal on Helsinki-2? And a general question: Are you ready now jointly to put forward an initiative on the Near East?

[Gorbachev] So, the first question concerning Helsinki-2. I think that at this meeting we discovered our fundamental understanding of the importance of the Helsinki process. We confirmed our adherence to this process, and noted the positive results of this process, those results which have now made it possible to carry out profound changes in Europe—and in the world, because Europe exerts its own immense influence, for well-known reasons. The President and I expressed ourselves in favour of the Helsinki process developing, now a manner appropriate to the new demands dictated by the times, to think about and create a new Europe on the basis of the changes which are bringing the European countries closer together. We confirmed that this is a common cause for all the European states that signed the Helsinki Final Act, for the Vatican, and naturally—and this was, incidentally, present whenever Europe, and not just Europe, began to be discussed—with the active and constructive participation of the United States of America and Canada. Thus, we expressed ourselves in favor of this process gathering force; getting, I would say, its second wind.

At this stage the transformation of the institutions which arose on the basis of the Helsinki process must take place in such a way that their nature should change in a direction appropriate to those changes which are taking place. If NATO and the Warsaw Treaty are being discussed, then they should most probably remain not so much as military organizations, but as military-political and later as political instruments, and their nature should thus change in accordance with the already changing situation on this continent. We evidently have a right to expect that the mutual relations between the European Community—Market—and the CEMA will change in precisely the same way, on the basis of greater openness towards one another, and naturally, once again with the active participation of the United States of America in these economic processes. In any case, we think the time has come for us to act in a considered manner, step by step, and taking the challenges of the times into account, but not in haste or irresponsibly so as to upset stability or reduce security. On the contrary, we must act in such a way that the atmosphere, situation, and relations are improved and that stability and security are strengthened. That was the key in which the conversation took place, and as I understood it—perhaps the President could confirm by a nod—our views here coincide. [audience laughs]

[Question] The meeting took place in the centre of the Mediterranean Sea. A question from the Soviet-Italian journal DIALOG: Was the problem of reducing the sides' military presence in the Mediterranean discussed at your meeting?

[Bush] Well, first on the reduction, we did not have specific figures in mind. I will remind you that you are talking about naval weapons, and I did not give a very positive response on this subject, but we agreed that we want to move forward. As far as Italy itself is concerned, as well as what influences Italy and the other countries which represent a powerful part of our allies, in the alliance, we are not trying to dot all the "i's".

To answer the second part of the question, I have to say that no joint initiative is needed to resolve this issue, but we found that the Soviet Union is playing a very constructive role in Lebanon and throughout the Middle East, and that it will provide support on precisely those matters which the United States has supported. This has not always been so in history, and it does not always have to be the way the U.S. side has viewed it. I can tell you, however, that after these discussions between Jim Baker and Mr Shevardnadze, there is a constructive role which is being played by the Soviet Union, the Soviet side is carrying out precisely this role. I said that a trilateral agreement, and I have to say that a peaceful solution to these issues is necessary in the Middle East, whether it is Lebanon or questions of the West Bank. I think that we do not disagree here.

[Gorbachev] My view of the Near East, in the context of discussion at this meeting—I can only add to what President Bush has said by saying that we discussed this subject substantively, and we discussed it just a moment ago, in a fairly substantial way. And it seems to me that we understand that we must use our possibilities, acting both independently or in interaction, to promote a solution to this problem, this old and dragged-out conflict which has had, in general, its negative effect on the entire situation in the world. It seems to me that we agreed that now, as a result of what the sides have gone through, we have approached a point when a real chance has emerged to take the final step toward opening the process of settlement, and one must not—it is important not to miss this chance because situations are changing quickly, and we think that we will make our contribution to this.

[Question in English] You have assured President Bush that the changes that are underway in Eastern Europe have an irreversible nature and that both President Bush and you, following this meeting, think that the Soviet Union has renounced the Brezhnev doctrine.

[Gorbachev] I would not want you to receive or perceive me here like that, like the plenipotentiary of all the states of Eastern Europe. That is not, would not be in keeping with reality. Yes, we are part of Eastern Europe, part of Europe, part of Eastern Europe. We interact with our allies in all spheres. Our links are deep. But each country

is an independent entity in world politics and each people has the right to decide and is deciding the destiny of its state. I can only say what my attitude is. I think that these changes in the Soviet Union and in the countries of Eastern Europe have been objectively prepared by the very progress of the historic process. No one can evade this. These are urgent problems. They have to be solved along new paths by using the experience and potential which has been accumulated in these states and also by opening up opportunities to use everything positive that has been accumulated in human civilization. I think we should welcome the direction of these processes because they are linked with the desire of these peoples to ennoble these societies, to give them a democratic, a more democratic and humane character, to open oneself up to the rest of the world.

So, the direction of these processes raises my spirits and I think that it is being received and appraised in the right way by other peoples, too. Naturally, I also see that processes are taking place—profound processes of changes—also in Western countries, including in West European countries. And this is also very important. In this way, as it were, a movement toward one another is taking place which is bringing the peoples and states of these continents closer together; nevertheless preserving processes in which each people preserves its identity and adheres to its own values, to its choices, and so on. That is very important. That is very important for us all to understand.

[Bush] There is no doubt here that great changes are taking place. No one casts doubt upon that statement. And when President Gorbachev says that changes are taking place, that they are taking place by peaceful means, of course this means a rejection of the previous doctrine which envisaged different approaches. They know—and not just the President, but everyone in the United States would like the democratic process to continue as previously in the countries of Eastern Europe. We were able to discuss this issue much more thoroughly and in greater detail that we expected at this conference.

[Question in English] President Bush, you have criticized the Soviet Union for the fact that it supplies arms to Central America. Mr Gorbachev, you have refuted that criticism. You are now sitting down together. Who is right and who is wrong?

[Bush] I'll be the first to try to answer that question. I don't think that we accuse the Soviet Union of this, but we say that deliveries of arms there are continuing and we don't like that, we aren't satisfied with that. I proceed from the fact that not only the Nicaraguans—that is taking place with their connivance—but they are encouraging it and there is direct evidence of that here. I do not doubt the words of the Soviet Union's foreign minister to our secretary. They have discussed this issue and I know that he, too, has spoken about this previously, that they support free elections. I also quoted to him the words of President Arias of Costa Rica who accuses the Sandinistas of exporting arms to other countries in the region, and that the situation in this region is thus being undermined. Perhaps we differ on this question, but when you say that I accuse them of supplying arms I did not accuse. Minister Shevardnadze made this perfectly clear to Secretary Baker. Everyone knows that weapons are being sent there widely on an international level, but whatever the source this is not satisfactory to us. We want evolution to continue in the direction of democracy.

[Gorbachev] The President has covered the discussion on this question correctly. No accusations were made against us. And we did not have to admit or to reject. We told the President that we have assurances, firm assurances, from Nicaragua that no deliveries, using well-known aircraft, have been carried out. President Bush did not agree with this. We also heard him out on that. But, nevertheless, the aspect of principle—and I have mentioned it and President Bush has confirmed it here—is that we are in favor of free elections, in the favor of this conflict being exhausted by political methods and of the situation there being normalized.

[Bush] I may add that I agree with this, it is our evaluation. I think that arms are being supplied to El Salvador and to other countries. I attest that I cannot gainsay the assertions which were made. But I think we have spoken the truth to our people and to Soviet people, because there are facts which testify that arms are being supplied. These are not necessarilly Soviet-made arms, but arms are nevertheless being supplied there. The only thing I want to say is that when Minister Shevardnadze said that arms are not being supplied through Nicaragua to El Salvador, this is perhaps a key question, it would perhaps have been better to delete this question.

Regarding holding free elections subject to monitoring, I can exert no influence on Castro whatsoever, but President Gorbachev may be able to exert influence on this, and then free elections may be held.

[Question] Was the question of Cuba creating an unstable situation in the region touched upon?

[Gorbachev] We discussed the situation in Latin America, in the Central zone, and stated our evaluations of it. On the basis of our analysis—on the basis of our analysis—and our evaluations, I told the President that conditions are maturing for the situation to change for the better. The various sides do have a desire to put an end to this acute period and to normalize relations but only in the region but also with the United States of America.

[Question] What is your evaluation of the German question?

[Bush] The United States fully adheres to the Helsinki accords. These give a clear concept of permanent borders. I gave President Gorbachev clearly to understand that we, for our part, do not want to do anything which might be unrealistic, and which might create in any

country conditions which might turn them backwards or which might give rise to military confrontation with various countries. Thus I think we have tried to act in accordance with the words uttered here by President Gorbachev, that is caution; and not simply to demonstrate how happy we are about the changes by leaping about on the Berlin Wall. We are simply happy that these changes are taking place. The German question has been repeatedly discussed by various leaders, and I do not think it is the United States' role to dictate. Any changes in any country should be determined by the peoples themselves. That is our position on this account. The last word on this is for the chairman.

[Gorbachev] Let's end on this: The President wrote to me in English, I do not read English. I replied to him in Russian; He does not read Russian. [laughter] But we came to agreement.

[Bush] No matter what it said.

[Gorbachev] I shall reply briefly, since over the past few days I have several times given an answer to this question. I can say that I confirm what I said earlier. But since the President and I have discussed this and exchanged opinions, we do indeed regard this from the position of the Helsinki process, which in effect summed up the results of World War II and consolidated the realities which emerged here. This is, I think, the truest policy, namely to stick strictly to the realities. And the reality is the composition of Europe today, where there are two German states, the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic, members of the United Nations, and sovereign states. So has history decreed.

Now, I always resort to this salutary topic, so to speak, or rather, I resort to this thesis: In order to remain realists, we must indeed allow history to decree destiny as a whole, and the processes taking place on the continent as a whole, including the place and role of these two states.

I think that everyone now has such an understanding. And every artificial nudging of this process would only complicate the whole watershed of enormous significance which is taking place in the development of European states, and this means in the central point of world politics. And I think this would also not be in the interests—artificial nudging—of the people of these two German states.

We can thank the press for its cooperation, although we do not yet know everything that they have written and what they will write!

[Bush] We reserve the right to thank them after they have written.

[Gorbachev] No. I think before—perhaps then they will write better! I want to thank you, Mr President, for your cooperation.

[Bush] We have to leave the hall at 1320. Perhaps we will answer one more question? Last question. Last question.

[Question in English] Do you consider that the personal relations which were formed here will assist in the holding of such summit meetings in the future?

[Bush] I also knew President Gorbachev earlier. I consider that we have established good personal contacts and relations. I consider that this helps both sides to talk frankly and to make known divergences and also to reveal disagreements. I consider this is very important since our two great powers play a very important role in light of the rapid changes that are taking place in the world. I am not saying that he likes me and as a result of this he will change his future stance. I cannot say that since I like him we will change the future stance of the United States. But, what have we done here? We gathered to discuss all issues without hostility and to discuss them quite frankly.

We would like to meet as often as possible in order to move even further forward. We have already arranged the date of the next summit meeting in order to discuss and make progress in the field of arms control [kontrol nad vooruzheniyami]. I have already said that we want to reach an accord in the field of conventional weapons, chemical weapons, and also strategic weapons. This is a very broad, extensive agenda. If there were not such discussions at the negotiating table we would not be able to find out the views of each other, of one or the other side on these issues.

[Gorbachev] I want to corroborate what Mr President has said, that we have been personally acquainted for a long time already. I can only add that maybe—of course, I have not agreed on this with the President—but I think I will not reveal a big secret if I say that we have already had thorough exchanges of views during our contacts before and, all in all, we have already outlined our positions in the main. This includes what we call by the password of either the chat in the car or the Governor's Island chat—and then it is clear right away what we are talking about. Subsequently, we had an exchange of correspondence and the present meeting today puts our personal contacts onto a new level. I am satisfied with the meetings and conversations that have taken place, including our two private talks. Like the President, I am also of the view that pesonal contacts represent a very important element in relations between political leaders and this is indeed even more the case where states such as the Soviet Union and the United States of America are concerned.

I am an advocate of personal ties, although, as the President has correctly said, this does not mean that we can sacrifice our positions because of personal ties, or that we become oblivious of our responsibility, no. I simply think that personal contacts make it possible for us to carry out our duties, to discharge our responsibilities and to interact better. And better interaction is both in the interests of our two peoples and in the interests of the entire world community. I personally express gratitude for this meeting; I thank the President for the

cooperation in a very important, joint political Soviet-U.S. enterprise, where the capital is split 50-50. [laughter]

Baker on Meeting, Forces' Discussion

LD0512072189 Moscow TASS in English 0701 GMT 5 Dec 89

[Text] Washington December 5 TASS—During the meetings and talks at the NATO headquarters in Brussels on the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit in Malta, "there was quite a bit of talk about the importance of moving the conventional forces agreement forward," U.S. Secretary of State James Baker told the CABLE NEWS NETWORK on Monday.

"President Bush and President Gorbachev both agreed in Malta that it would be a good thing to do, that is to complete it by next year," he said during his appearance in the CNN's world day programme.

Baker pointed out, however, that NATO countries do not consider the possibility of additional cuts in conventional armed forces and armaments in Europe, apart from the already suggested ones.

"There was no discussion in terms of specifics with the Soviet Union about further conventional force reductions. There was only a very general discussion about conventional forces," he said.

IZVESTIYA Cites U.S. Reactions

PM0512114989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondents A. Blinov, A. Shalnev dispatch under the general heading "The Upshot of the Meeting Is Cooperation"]

[Text] Washington—"The Upshot of the Meeting Is Cooperation"—this was the headline with which THE WASHINGTON POST accompanied a report on the conclusion of talks between the Soviet and U.S. leaders on Malta. The U.S. press and political circles are positively assessing their results.

In an ABC television program, prominent figures from the United States' two leading parties, the Democrats and the Republicans, gave their opinions on the now concluded Soviet-U.S. dialogue.

"I think the meeting was a success," G. Mitchell, leader of the Democratic majority in Senate, said. The Democratic senator attaches particular significance to the prospects of improvement in Soviet-American trade and economic ties and the possibility of speeding up the pace of talks on concluding arms control agreements. The leader of the Democrats said that for a number of months he has been repeatedly urging the G. Bush administration to take steps in this direction. "I am glad that this has now happened," G. Mitchell stressed. "I think it was a good meeting," R. Dole, leader of the Republican minority, said in turn.

According to THE WASHINGTON POST's diplomatic correspondent, D. Oberdorfer, the Malta meeting "has opened wide the way to political and economic cooperation between the Soviet Union and the United States for the first time since World War II." This, in the observer's opinion, represents a much bigger step forward in comparison to the previous stage, characterized by the gradual removal of enmity in relations between the two countries. In D. Oberdorfer's opinion, it is particularly important that G. Bush and M.S. Gorbachev have demonstrated their political will to work in favor of stability in a world characterized by rapid changes. The journalist regards the U.S. President's consent to set June next year as the ultimate deadline for resolving the problems connected with concluding a treaty on 50 percent cuts in the Soviet and U.S. strategic nuclear arsenals as an important result of the talks. Moreover, the American side's agreement with the Soviet proposal to sign a treaty on reducing conventional arms and armed forces belonging to NATO and the Warsaw Pact in Europe by the end of next year also has important significance.

Democratic Senator Sam Nunn is one of the most influential American legislators. The stance taken by the Senate's Armed Services Committee, of which he is chairman, depends to an enormous extent on the stand he takes himself.

It is is no coincidence, therefore, that Senator Nunn was one of the first people approached by reporters requesting an opinion on the results of the Malta summit meeting. The senator expressed satisfaction with the way the meeting had gone and described it as "successful and constructive." However, the senator voiced concern that, in working for the earliest possible conclusion of a treaty on strategic arms, Moscow and Washington could, in his words, come up with a "bad treaty"—in other words, a treaty in which not all the problems and difficulties, including difficulties with monitoring implementation of the agreement, are properly resolved and overcome.

Developing this idea in an interview with the CBS television company, the senator said that the political aspects of the arms control process are developing more vigorously than the technical aspects—that is, the aspects directly connected with the details of future accords. This rushing ahead, S. Nunn believes, could give rise to expectations among the U.S. public and all over the world that will not be able to be realized in full within the deadline set for the conclusion of the agreement, namely by June next year.

In the interview given by Sam Nunn we should draw attention to his interesting proposal that the Soviet and U.S. presidents select special groups of their high-ranking advisers for the conceptual discussion, as the senator put it, of the question of "where to go next, after the conclusion of agreements on strategic arms and conventional types of arms."

Michael Mandelbaum, senior scientific associate of the prestigious International Relations Council in New York, is convinced that "there is a serious chance of reaching an accord on strategic nuclear arms by the next summit meeting." From his point of view, the Malta meeting showed that henceforth the administration in Washington is "totally committed to its new policy toward the Soviet Union and the policy of economic involvement and acceleration of the arms control process." According to Mandelbaum, by proclaiming this commitment, President George Bush has "signaled to other Western countries and Japan that they, too, should follow this policy."

Gerasimov Terms Meeting 'Turning Point'

LD0412230789 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 2100 GMT 4 Dec 89

[Text] The special plane of the Moscow-based foreign correspondents followed, with some delay, that of Gorbachev coming back from Malta. However, Jozsef Barath, has been able to obtain really exclusive information in this way, 10,000 meters up in the sky.

[Barath] Naturally, Malta did not correct the Yalta agreements with respect to national borders, but in a political sense it opens a new era because it has terminated the cold war, and ended the period when the great powers divided, in a bargain, Europe into spheres of interests.

This is how spokesman Gerasimov replied to a question at the press conference he held between Malta and Moscow on board the plane chartered for journalists. Gerasimov has confirmed that the Soviet Union does not, in the future, intend to interfere in the affairs of European socialist countries even if—and this is not a secret—Moscow is not sympathetic with the political line of certain countries.

It is an important development of the summit that the ice broke with respect to economic relations. President Bush appeared at last ready to commit himself to promote perestroyka via economic cooperation. The Soviet Union also received a promise of elimination of the Jackson-Vanik amendment which limits trade. High time, Gerasimov declared, and with his wry sense of humour he added: After all, the Soviet parliament did not adopt an Ivanov-Petrov amendment that the Soviet Union will not supply the United States with caviar as long as Washington keeps out would-be Jewish immigrants waiting for an entry visa."

At the summit, for the first time, it was the Soviet Union and not the United States which initiated discussion on the issue of human rights.

The significance of Malta equals Reykjavik because the latter, too, was a turning point, the Soviet spokesman said somewhere above Kiev.

IZVESTIYA Sums Up Meeting

PM0412202789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Dec 89 Morning Edition pp 1,5

[IZVESTIYA special correspondent S. Kondrashov commentary: "What is Promised by Malta"]

[Text] Marsaxlokk Bay - Moscow—The meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and G. Bush in Marsaxlokk Bay, Malta, came to a close on Sunday at about 1500 without any new agreements or concrete results, which had actually been expected by both sides and fitted into the strategy of the meeting. At the same time, the first personal contact between the Soviet leader and the new U.S. President convincingly confirmed the new nature of relations between the two powers and gave an important boost to their collaboration, which guarantees concrete results and important agreements in the future.

One of them is the treaty on cuts in strategic offensive arms. It is most likely that this treaty will be signed at the official summit meeting planned for the second half of June 1990. The new nature of relations is based on an evident coincidence of interests, created primarily by Soviet restructuring and which opens up real prospects for sharply reducing arms and military expenditures, which is demanded in one way or another by the domestic needs of the Soviet and American peoples.

By no means succumbing to euphoria, both sides are displaying caution, restraint, and a sense of realism, as shown by the joint press conference given by M.S. Gorbachev and G. Bush, and are not concealing their differences on a number of issues, particularly in their approaches to the problems of Central America. But one can say that they are civilized differences, when, while disagreeing on something, they look for points of understanding and seek to reduce rather than increase these differences.

This, in my view, is how one should assess the general outcome of the unofficial working meeting, which proceeded in a friendly, frank atmosphere and in somewhat unusual, unplanned conditions.

Although President Bush, as I pointed out in my previous dispatch, had insisted on the eve of the meeting that its surprise would only consist in its absence of surprises, there was one surprise nevertheless, and a fairly significant one at that. As you know, it did not come from the politicians, but from nature. When the choice of rendezvous was made, they evidently failed to take account of the fact that the weather in Malta is rather changeable at this time of year. A powerful storm, which swept into the bay open to the winds and waves, put paid to the idea of meeting on the two cruisers, the *Slava* and *Belknap,* which were anchored but under attack from waves 2 meters high or more.

Both days of talks had to be held on the Soviet passenger liner, the *Maksim Gorkiy,* moored about half a mile

away from the two cruisers. Before the meeting, the Americans had apparently complained that the arrival of the Soviet diesel ship upset the balance in Marsaxlokk Bay, but in the stormy weather they appreciated the foresight and precautionary action of their partner.

Incidentally, on Saturday, 2 December, a conversation planned in the program for the afternoon had to be cancelled because of the storm. They also had to cancel the dinner which President Bush had planned to give in M.S. Gorbachev's honor in the evening of the same day on the cruiser *Belknap* which was to involve approximately 25 people on both sides. The Americans agreed to move the venue of the dinner from their cruiser to our liner, but unfortunately the sea was raging even more strongly than in the morning and the gangway on the righthand side of the *Belknap* was damaged. This produced a quite dramatic and curious scene: The President of an all-powerful country could not be taken from on board a staff ship of the U.S. 6th Fleet either by launch or by helicopter. However, the President bravely rode out the storm and, not losing his sense of humor, offered an interview to any journalist who could swim across to the place of his unexpected incarceration. There were no courageous volunteers, however. And at the press center in the Maltese capital of Valletta, some 20 km from the bay, a briefing of Soviet and U.S. representatives was also cancelled in view of the circumstances.

During the night of Saturday to Sunday, people checked and double-checked the weather forecasts for the coming hours and waited for nature to be kinder to them. Among the passengers on the *Maksim Gorkiy*, your correspondent also looked out of the porthole in the morning and ascertained by eye that the storm had abated and the waves diminished. By 1000 on 3 December, President Bush and Secretary of State Baker, who had narrowly escaped sea sickness, and other members of his delegation arrived once more on board the *Maksim Gorkiy* to be met by M.S. Gorbachev, E.A. Shevardnadze, and A.N. Yakovlev. This meant that once again there had been a change of rendezvous: It had been assumed that the second day of talks would be held on board the cruiser *Belknap*.

The program remained the same, however. First of all, the enlarged delegations met in the library on the promenade deck. Then the two leaders had a private conversation in the neighboring "Zhiguli" room. This was followed by something that was not on the meeting's agenda: a joint press conference. It was held in the music room on the same promenade deck, in the bow of the ship. The salon can accomodate about 300 people. On this occasion there were more than that present.

So, we had surprises from the weather and the symbols of politics. The first joint press conference by the leaders of the two nuclear powers in history is an important symbol of the increased mutual understanding between them, the degree of trust, and the absence of the suspicion which quite recently had still totally ruled out the possibility of such events, particularly on the U.S. side. Thanks to the weather, which made its own amendments to the program, another symbol, if you like, was the change of rendezvous from the two cruisers to a civilian passenger ship. The cruisers could not help but have warlike associations which were entirely inappropriate to the spirit of the meeting.

One does, of course, feel sorry for our naval personnel, who had made the long and honorable crossing and scrubbed their *Slava* in expectation of a truly rare, solemn moment. They had even attached copper plaques with the names of the high-ranking guests on the doors of the cabins where they were to have spent a few hours, but, alas, these are now nothing more than evidence of what should have been but was not. M.S. Gorbachev never came on board our missile cruiser and G. Bush only sailed around it in his launch en route to the *Maksim Gorkiy*. On the other hand, the shares of the passenger liner, which is mainly used for hard currency cruises with foreigners, have been given a massive boost. What an advertisement! There is no other ship in the world that could boast of such visitors meeting on such a significant occasion; many observers believe that we bade farewell to the "cold war" in Marsaxlokk Bay.

Even more important is not what actually happened, but what is promised by Malta. The speed with which these promises are clarified and realized is also important. A new beginning has been laid, which must be built on and developed. The meeting has confirmed that, strategically speaking, the Bush Administration is quite definite in its support for restructuring in the Soviet Union and the present Soviet foreign policy course. Moscow's positive attitude to the rapid changes in Eastern Europe was, for Washington, both confirmation and consolidation of the choice made. As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, it is now even more strongly established in its principles of constructive collaboration with the United States and other Western countries.

From Malta's Luqa Airport, President Bush flew to Brussels, where he was awaited by his NATO allies. Twenty minutes later, M.S. Gorbachev's plane took off; he is having a meeting on Monday with the leaders of the other Warsaw Pact member-states. There is reason to believe that the allies in Moscow and Brussels will approve of the results of the Malta meeting. There is also reason to say that the talks in progress in Geneva and Vienna on nuclear and conventional arms are now "doomed" to succeed. The complex of questions about the feedback from the period of peace that has now begun—for our people and their everyday life—is being placed on a more concrete footing. How swift will this feedback be, how effective, and how productive? There is an enormous amount of work ahead, and we certainly cannot say that we are totally ready for it. Returning on the aircraft with our experts on arms control and on reducing military expenditure, I heard precisely this leitmotif: We must make maximum, sensible, scientific use of the fruits of peacetime, which is now establishing itself after decades of ideological and military confrontation.

TV Discussants View Talks

LD0412165389 Moscow World Service in English 1910 GMT 3 Dec 89

["Top Priority" program, hosted by Sergey Goryachev, with (Sergey Rogov), head of the Department of Military and Political Studies of the Institute of the USA and Canada; and (Andrey Kortunov), not further identified]

[Text] [Goryachev] How do you do, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the show. I am sitting in today for Pavel Kuznetsov, who has been in Malta covering the summit for Radio Moscow. And together with me here are two experts from the Institute of U.S. and Canadian Studies, Sergey Plekhanov to my right, and (Andrey Kortunov). Sergey, this is the first time you participate in this show. You are an expert on disarmament issues.

[(Kortunov)] May I make a slight correction? He is not Sergey Plekhanov, who is a frequent visitor to "Top Priority." He is (Sergey Rogov).

[Goryachev] Yes, and he is not Sergey Goryachev, your host of this program. Anyway, what is your speciality?

[(Rogov)] My speciality is military and political relations of the Soviet Union. I am in charge of the Department of Military and Political Studies of the Institute of USA and Canada.

[Goryachev] So you are a very valuable guest for this show (?today).

[(Rogov)] I hope so.

[Goryachev] Yes. Of course, the views expressed today are not the views of the Soviet Government. These are the personal views of the guests; and of course the "top priority" these days is the summit meeting in Malta, which has just ended, and we will discuss it and make some predictions, if it is possible, and we will evaluate the outcome of the summit.

Probably we will begin discussing the bilateral issues, which were raised by both President Gorbachev and Mr Bush. What do you think will make these bilateral relations better? What will be the main thing which will get better as a result of the summit?

[(Rogov)] I think that this is the (?fourth) summit, although it is called a nonsummit summit, but this is the (?fourth) meeting of the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States for the past 4 decades, which demonstrates that the cold war period is over.

[(Kortunov)] Or is almost over, some people say.

[(Rogov)] I would agree with this correction, and I think this summit will make a very important contribution in changing the grammar, changing the (?terms) in which we discuss the cold war, because the Soviet Union and the United States are already moving into a new relationship which will correspond to the system of international relations based not on bipolarity but multipolarity. And this new relationship is characterized in my opinion by priority which is being gained by the common and parallel interests of the Soviet Union and the United States. Of course, competition continues, but today this competition is not playing the dominant role as it used to be, and today we clearly see a certain de-ideologization of the Soviet-American relations. Ideology was not playing a major role in this...

[Goryachev]...summit.

[(Kortunov)] You're right.

[(Rogov)] Yes, I agree.

[(Kortunov)] Yes, and I would add that hopefully the summit can lift some obstacles on the way of normal, I would say mature, Soviet-American relationship. For example, take the issue of Soviet-American trade. That was really crippled by, you know, a lot of artificial restrictions and obstacles. I guess that one of the agreements reached in Malta was an agreement to, you know, to make American restrictions on Soviet exports to the United States at least more loose, or probably to abolish some restrictions altogether.

[(Rogov)] I do not know anything that indicates that Americans will be somehow helping the Soviet Union additionally, that the United States would like to contribute to the Soviet economy.

[Goryachev] Except for their willingness or in their readiness to lift probably the restrictions.

[(Kortunov)] Well, you know, I would say that first of all the Americans do not have money to help Soviet economy. They could hardly get less than a billion dollars to help Hungary and Poland. The second, I guess, that we really do not need a lot of American help in, you know, in the sense of some grants. What we can need from Americans is investments, rather than aid. And I think that it is extremely important to create what is called favorable investment climate in the Soviet Union, because till now we can not absorb even the investments or credits that were granted to us by West European countries. That's the problem. In this sense I think it's incorrect to speak about the United States giving assistance to the Soviet Union. What we talk about and should talk about is the normalization of economic relationship between two nations, and this normalization is, in my opinion, part of a larger process, and that is integration of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in the world economy. And that's why the barriers which were blocking normal relationship should be removed, and removed on both sides, because, well, on both sides were either political or economic blocks which prevented us from developing such a relationship which would be fruitful for both sides.

[Goryachev] We have indications that the Soviet Union will clarify its laws by, say, January or February, when new law on emigration will be passed by the Supreme Soviet, and probably by that time the United States will lift the Jackson-Vanik Amendment. Do you think so?

[(Rogov)] Well, I think that it is inevitable. I personally am more concerned about Stevenson Amendment than with Jackson-Vanik Amendment, but I also think that the United States can be more persistent in doing something with COCOM [Coordinating Committee for East-West Trade Policy] regulations that still exist and still create, you know, a major barrier on East-West trade in general. What is needed and what should be done as early as possible, is removal of such restrictions which have nothing to do with military application of technology, and there are plenty of examples when COCOM regulations were used to block this kind of transaction.

[Goryachev] You mentioned the military implications. Let me turn over to arms control issues raised at the summit meeting, and first of course is the proposal to reduce these weapons by 50 percent by next summer, and do you think this goal is achievable?

[(Kortunov)] I think this goal is achievable, and it is very important that the negotiations on 50 percent reduction of the strategic arms should be speeded so we can have an early agreement as soon as next summer. The Soviet-American relations is of greatest importance in terms of prevention of nuclear war; and prevention of nuclear war means reduction of arms and reversing of the nuclear arms race. And in this sense, the 50-percent reduction may be seen only as a first step, because with such tremendous overkill capacity, which both the United States and the Soviet Union possess today, we are able to blow up the whole world many, many times. This is absolutely irrational, and thus the 50-percent reduction agreement should be followed by further reductions later, in the 90's, which should drastically diminish the threat of nuclear war and bring us to a much higher level of strategic stability.

[Goryachev] Of course, we need more, but I wish we achieved only 50-percent for the first step and then proceed.

[(Kortunov)] Yes, and I think that, you know, the first major step in this direction was made during Wyoming meeting between Shevardnadze and Baker; but still, though, the principal problems were eliminated. There are a lot of technical issues, you know, the issues of verification and the issue of specific provisions of the treaty, and certainly one can have this treaty in a year or in 2 years, depending on how, you know, how the people who are negotiating in Geneva, how they are enthusiastic about having the treaty. And from this point of view, I think it's important that in Malta another push was made in this direction, to have the treaty in half a year.

[Goryachev] Conventional forces are no less dangerous, taking into account a lot of nuclear reactors for nuclear power plants in Europe. And of course, the Europeans are very much interested in cutting these weapons, and negotiations are underway, and we have some indications after the summit that a treaty on these conventional forces can be achieved by next summer. What do you think makes both of the presidents optimistic as for why they can achieve this treaty by next summer? Any major breakthroughs—have you noticed them?

[(Kortunov)] Well, I think that we have seen good will expressed on both sides, and there is an understanding that the political situation in Europe is developing so fast that we should hurry up, we should speed up the process of negotiations, or it will be just outpaced by the development of political events in Europe, so I think that both leaders feel that it is important to have bilateral Soviet-American understanding on the subject, despite the fact that this is, of course, the issue that should be discussed on (?a) multilateral basis.

[(Rogov)] In my opinion there is a certain paradox, and that's connected not only with the issue of the conventional arms reductions. When both sides today need to strengthen stability, while encouraging drastic changes, and on the other hand, they need not to jeopardize stability while these changes are happening, and in my opinion, both Soviet and American leaders during this summit meeting, they expressed willingness to cooperate. [sentence as heard] So while solving old problems we won't create new ones.

[Goryachev] Some people say that changes create instability, others argue that some of the changes, like in Eastern Europe, can lead to more stability. Do you agree with that?

[(Rogov)] Well, of course, in the long run I think the changes will lead to more stability because we'll have, you know, political democracies in Eastern Europe, which should be more stable than the regimes they had there just a couple of months ago; but the transitionary period can be quite unstable, and what I am really afraid of is that if the process of political democratization in Eastern Europe and in the Soviet Union coincides with further deterioration of economic situation there, that can lead to a, well, to a situation when the basic idea of democracy is compromised...

[Goryachev]...and endangered.

[(Rogov)]...And can be endangered, and instead of democratic regimes we'll see authoritarian and quite nationalistic regimes, and the main force of their legitimacy will be nationalism rather than democratic will of the people there. That's the problem of (?the) transitionary period, and I hope that we will manage to escape such a turn of events. And in this sense I'm very much encouraged by the attitude of the two presidents. Of course, the Soviet Union started the perestroyka, and in this sense the changes in Eastern Europe are very closely related to what is happening in our country, but I'm also encouraged by the attitude of the Bush Administration, which is trying to demonstrate that it doesn't want to utilize the

situation in Eastern Europe to get some kind of imaginary, one-sided advantages. And I think the caution which was expressed by President Bush while discussing this issue is a very good sign.

[Goryachev] As president Gorbachev said, both sides exercise major responsibility; he said it today, at the press conference. Now let's go to one of the questions which both sides indicated is a point of disagreement, and that is in naval forces. As I understand, the two sides could not come to an agreement on that, so I would like you, Sergey, to give us some background. What is really happening in this field of naval forces?

[(Rogov)] If you compare the Soviet Union and the United States as the two military superpowers, they would remind you of an old children's debate: Who is stronger, an elephant or a whale? And of course, the Soviet Union traditionally was a great land power and the United States traditionally was a naval power. And what is happening today is that the Soviet Union is not only conducting unilateral reductions—and you know we are reducing our troops in Eastern Europe and in the Soviet Union by 500,000—but we also agreed for equal levels for Warsaw Pact troops and NATO troops in Europe, and in this sense, (?well), the superiority which the Soviet Union and its allies had in many fields of conventional land forces is going to disappear; and in this new situation, the superiority which the United States and their allies have as far as the navies are concerned, well, they look in a different light. For instance, the United States has 14 aircraft carrier groups which may threaten Europe, which may threaten the Soviet territory, and the Soviet Union is not demanding equality with the United States [words indistinct] are wanting parity.

[(Kortunov)] But our elephant tries to swim, as you know.

[(Rogov)] All right, we are doing some things in this field, but what is much better in my opinion is, well, stopping the arms race on land to prevent speeding up of this arms race in the sea. And that's why we want the United States to respond more positively to our suggestions to start negotiations on this subject.

[(Kortunov)] I think that today the American Administration is not yet ready, but on the other hand, the United States is discussing some reductions of American military forces, including naval forces, because of the budgetary reasons.

[(Rogov)] I would like to add, not only because of the budgetary reasons. The threat is disappearing, the threat is diminishing, and that, of course, demands a (?realization) of how much is enough.

[Goryachev] Anyway, we have some disagreements on naval forces now. Andrey, do you think this disagreement can affect the negotiations on other fields, like on conventional forces, chemical forces, and (?what) Strategic weapons?

[(Kortunov)] I hope not, because [pauses]...still these negotiations can be separated from what is going on in Europe on chemical weapons negotiations that have specific meaning. I think it's [pauses]...another issue which is extremely important is the issue of arms transfers to the Third World countries, which has been raised during the summit, and it was another point of disagreement. I think we should be much more persistent in trying to curb these arms transfers to Third World countries, especially to very heated regions of the world. And there should be, of course, some rules of behavior for all sides. I think that what is important and what was manifested during the summit is that both sides understood finally that you cannot solve regional conflicts by military force, and by providing regimes in Third World countries with more and more weapons. I think that in Afghanistan, for example, Americans underestimated the potential of the existing regime to keep in power, and, on the other hand, as you know in Central America, the Soviet Union expressed quite explicitly that it is for free elections in Nicaragua.

[Goryachev] And the United States agreed.

[(Kortunov)] And certainly the United States are thinking along the same lines. And I think that this mutual understanding will lead to, well, some agreement or least some tacit understanding between the two superpowers to curb arms transfers to Third World countries, especially if we are speaking about very sophisticated and modern arms which can be extremely dangerous, because they are not controlled by anybody. And, you know, we have huge amounts of weaponry in the hands of people which are quite irresponsible.

[(Rogov)] Besides, it also allows to remove the question of so-called linkage between regional conflicts and arms control. In my opinion, this agenda which was discussed at Malta allows simultaneously to deal with the arms control issues and regional conflict issues, and also global issues which are gaining priority as far as both the Soviet Union and the United States and the entire world is concerned; and that's why such issues as, for instance, discussion of a future joint effort and organization of a conference which will deal with the problem of warming up of the atmosphere is recognition by both sides that the real priority for everybody today is not continuation of the cold war, but creation of a more peaceful and stable relationship for both the Soviet Union and the United States, and international system of relations.

[Goryachev] And that probably will wind up our program. Of course, we could not discuss all the issues raised at the summit. We simply do not have much time. We will continue doing that. Thank you very much for listening. Goodbye.

Academician Views Results

OW0412063489 Tokyo NHK General Television Network in Japanese 1352 GMT 3 Dec 89

[Interview with Vitaliy Zhurkin, director of the European Studies Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences,

by NHK correspondent Kazuo Kobayashi at an unidentified location in Malta—live; from a special 130-minute program devoted to the Bush-Gorbachev Malta talks; interview follows a live interview with former U.S. Secretary of State James Schlesinger; interview conducted in English with superimposed Japanese translation by Akiko Shinoda; following is from the Japanese]

[Text] [Video shows NHK newscaster Jiro Hirano in the Tokyo studio, with subtitles reading "U.S.-Soviet Summit Talks in Malta"]

[Hirano] We have Mr Zhurkin, director of the European Studies Institute of the Soviet Union, on the scene in Malta. Our correspondent Kobayashi is going to interview him. Mr Kobayashi.

[Kobayashi] Yes, this is Kobayashi.

[Hirano] I believe you heard what Mr Schlesinger had to say.

[Kobayashi] Yes, we heard him here too.

[Hirano] He said that domestic affairs in the Soviet Union will be an issue from now. Would you interview Mr Zhurkin on that subject as well?

[Kobayashi] All right, I will. [Video cuts to Malta where Zhurkin and Kobayashi are shown sitting on stools and facing each other]

[Kobayashi] Mr Zhurkin, just now Mr Schlesinger said that the current talks were a success. What is your opinion?

[Zhurkin] I agree with him. I mean, with what Mr Schlesinger said at the beginning. However, although I agree with the beginning part of his remarks, I cannot agree with some of the points he made later on.

[Kobayashi] What do you mean?

[Zhurkin] I think that many times in history the Soviet Union has been described as being on the decline and stagnant. Certainly, the Soviet Union is facing difficulties in the economic sector today. There also are the ethnic problem and many other problems. But the Soviet Union is a great power, and I think that the Soviet Union will continue to a superpower in the days ahead. So, when you look at the Soviet Union I think that you should take a balanced view of it. I think that you should make a realistic evaluation when you look at the Soviet Union. It certainly has problems, but you should take a balanced view of it.

However, the latest talks, I think, were very fruitful. Looking at the talks, I think that the leaders of the two countries chose their words very cautiously with regard to the new situation in Eastern Europe, in the socialist bloc. It seems to me that there certainly was a sense of caution to be felt. I can understand very well why.

To be sure, the United States and the Soviet Union are superpowers which play very important roles in the world. At the same time, however, the United States has allies behind it and the Soviet Union also has its allies behind it. These allies play their respective roles. Tomorrow President Bush will be meeting with leaders of the U.S. allies and Chairman Gorbachev will be meeting with leaders of the Soviet allies in Moscow. I think that only then will we be able to see more concretely what is going to happen.

The two leaders definitely talked about European reforms and also the necessity of overcoming the division of Europe and the future of Europe. At the same time, however, they had to be cautious. I think that this was a natural outcome.

Listening to Chairman Gorbachev's remarks, in my personal view, the Soviet Union at the moment is opposed to a so-called merger of East and West Germany. In my personal opinion, there are various aspects in the Soviet approach or the Soviet posture on the German issue or on German reunification. First of all, there are a variety of international treaties, accords, and agreements. All in all, the CSCE, or the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, has a membership of 35 countries. Overall coordination must be obtained with all those countries.

And if you make too much haste and try to forcibly do something with regard to this reunification issue, I think that not only the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, but also other countries including France, for instance, will be antagonized in various ways. (?Benelux) is no exception, and Britain has also expressed its stand against it. They seem to be entertainin quite complicated sentiments. U.S. politicians also seem to think that they must make a cautious approach as far as this reunification issue is concerned. So, there should be no coercion involved. I think that if too much haste is made in connection with the reunification issue, it will inevitably stir up things all over Europe. In other words, it may jeopardize the integration process now under way in Western Europe.

[Kobayashi] Then, are you saying that [words indistinct] are reflected?

[Zhurkin] I agree with President Bush's view but I have a point which I want to emphasize. This is my understanding—and I believe the Soviet people share it with me—namely, that no one knows what will happen in 15 or 20 years from now. Only history or time will tell what will happen. I think that no one can make any final, or decisive statement about it now, at least not at the present stage.

[Kobayashi] In that case, as a Japanese professor at the Tokyo studio mentioned earlier, the Soviet Union is not going to do away with the Brezhnev Doctrine itself, is it?

[Zhurkin] The Soviet Union has very clearly and precisely abrogated this Brezhnev Doctrine. It is somewhat ironical, but actually the Brezhnev Doctrine does not expressly spell out anything clearly. I do not know if

Japanese or other people know as precisely as we do what is meant by the so-called Brezhnev doctrine whenever they talk about it. I am not sure if that term means the right to interve in the internal affairs of other countries. But that sort of thing is already past history in the Soviet Union. In both our statements and our actions, such a doctrine, or intervention, no longer exists—100 percent.

[Kobayashi] Coming to my last question, some people say that the Soviets needed the latest summit talks. They say that the Soviet Union would be in trouble if the summit talks were not held. They say so because of the instability in the current domestic situation in the Soviet Union. What is your comment on this?

[Zhurkin] The difficulties, and the sad plight the Soviet Union finds itself in, are questions to be solved by the Soviet people themselves. Our economic problem and the ethnic question are big historic challenges. They are big challenges and tasks for us. Really, the whole country is coming to grips with them. No other country or people will or can solve them for us. Of course, a favorable international environment will be helpful to promoting perestroyka. Therefore, if Chairman Gorbachev's foreign policy is favorably received by other countries, it will mean that much more to us. It is very important to us, to be sure However, I think that the same thing applies to Japan when it comes to its domestic issues. It is for the Japanese people to solve their own domestic problems. We also think that we should solve our own problems ourselves.

[Kobayashi] Thank you very much. [Speaking to the Tokyo studio] Do you have any questions to ask him from your end?

[Hirano] No, I don't have anything to ask in particular. Thank you.

Further Zhurkin Interview

OW0412142389 Tokyo NHK General Television Network in Japanese 1247 GMT 4 Dec 89

[Interview with Vitaliy Zhurkin, director of the European Studies Institute of the USSR Academy of Social Sciences, by NHK newscaster Jiro Hirano via satellite; interview conducted in English superimposed by simultaneous Japanese translation provided by unidentified translators; Hirano is shown sitting in NHK Tokyo studio while only audio version of Zhurkin's answers heard throughout the interview; from the "NHK News Today" program; following is from the Japanese—live]

[Text] [Video shows NHK newscaster Jiro Hirano in the Tokyo studio with a still picture of Zhurkin]

[Hirano] Well, we will start asking Mr Zhurkin some questions right now. Mr Zhurkin in Moscow, do you hear me?

[Zhurkin] Yes, I do.

[Hirano] We interviewed you in Malta yesterday. You are back in Moscow now. What is the general reaction of people in Moscow to the summit [samitto]?

[Zhurkin] Well, yes. They frankly [sunao-ni] accepted the outcome. They accepted it as a historical event. Aside from minor points, they accepted the result in general. The people accepted the fact that relations between the Soviet Union and the United States are different from what they used to be. And we can say that the curtain has been raised for a new age. Another important point lies in the fact that both President Bush and Chairman Gorbachev frankly exchanged their views on various points concerning the future. This is very important. In this sense, the Malta summit was a historical event.

[Hirano] Has the Warsaw Pact summit meeting started?

[Zhurkin] Would you please repeat your question?

[Hirano] Has the Warsaw Pact summit meeting started?

[Zhurkin] I think it already started.

[Hirano] And you have President Ceausescu in the meeting also?

[Zhurkin] I am sorry but I have no idea because no announcement was made on the participants of the meeting. But I think President Ceausescu should be among the participants. I think all the representatives are attending the meeting.

[Hirano] Do you think that Romanian President Ceausescu will be isolated?

[Zhurkin] I don't think the Romanian issue should be taken in that way because there have been dramatic changes in the past few years and the Soviet Union and Romania have carried on friendly discussions. And our two nations are well aware of the differences in opinions. They have not been brought up all of a sudden. Discussions will be conducted in a creative way at the current meeting. Differences in opinions also exist between the Soviet Union and the United States. Various opinions will be exchanged at the Warsaw Pact meeting and that is all. Conclusions will probably be worked out in a creative way.

[Hirano] Thank you very much.

Comparison of Gorbachev-Adami Meeting

PM0312173589

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 3 December 1989 carries in its Second Edition on page 1 a report on Gorbachev's meeting with Malta's Prime Minister Adami. The PRAVDA report, entitled "Meeting Between M.S. Gorbachev and E. Fenech Adami, Prime Minister of Malta," has been compared with the Moscow TASS English version published in the 4 December

Soviet Union DAILY REPORT under the headline "Meets Maltese Premier" on pages 21-22, revealing the following variations:

Page 21, paragraph one, sentence one in PRAVDA reads: On his arrival in Malta 1 December, M.S. Gorbachev met Maltese Prime Minister E. Fenech Adami.

Gorbachev expressed to... (omitting dateline, substituting date for "Friday," omitting sentence)

Paragraph two, sentence one in PRAVDA reads: summit off Malta. We regard this as readiness of... (omitting phrase, rewording)

Page 22, only paragraph, last sentence in PRAVDA reads: and other fields.

Taking part in the conversation were E.A. Shevardnadze, A.N. Yakovlev, V.Ya. Plechko, USSR ambassador to Malta, M.J. Lubrano, Maltese ambassador to the USSR, E. Saliba [name as published], the prime minister's adviser, and R. Kakiya Karuana [name as published], the prime minister's aide. (providing additional passage)

Jurist Comments on Baltic Role in Soviet-U.S. Ties

LD0212144389

[Editorial Report] Riga in Latvian to Europe at 2105 GMT on 26 November, in its "Amber Coast" program, broadcasts a 14-minute feature entitled "The Baltic Question: A Fishbone in the Throat of Soviet-U.S. Relations" in which Valdis Birkavs, president of the Society of Jurists of Latvia, is interviewed on Soviet-U.S. relations in light of the current situation in the Baltic republics.

Birkavs begins by recalling his participation in the so-called Chatauqua Conference on Jurmala which, he believes, was the first attempt at openness on Soviet radio and television. At the fifth Chataugua conference in Pittsburgh the participants discussed the Baltic question when, Birkavs continues, it seems that despite the friendliness between the Soviet and U.S. governments, the Baltic problem was like a bone stuck in the throat. "The two great powers were being very friendly toward each other," he says. "The American attitude was enchanting, and the three Latvian representatives, as Russians from the Soviet Union, were melting in the glow of American goodwill. But we kept reminding ourselves that we were, after all, Latvians. And I was pleased to note that the Kazakhs and Uzbeks reminded themselves that they were Kazakhs and Uzbeks."

The interviewer asks about the U.S. attitude toward this "bone in the throat" and Birkavs replies that although the Baltic question was being pushed aside, at the same time the activity of the American Latvians brought it back to the center and the focus of attention. Birkavs goes on: "When, for example, Yakovlev, the minister of justice, tried to behave kind of ignorantly toward the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, then instantly whistles and yells of condemnation were heard in the hall, and he was compelled to react by offering as courtesy the observation that, yes, after all, that was a question for the Baltic peoples themselves; they themselves must decide how it was and how it will be. He felt that concrete atmosphere, that there was a reaction to this."

After relating an anecdote about a visit to Columbus, Ohio, Birkavs says: "Returning to the question about the fishbone, then it must be clearly stated that both Bush and Gorbachev have a feeling of discomfort, because Bush now ardently supports—and this was very clearly expressed in Baker's message—that the U.S. Administration now supports restructuring. It is also necessary for Gorbachev, of course, to improve relations with the United States.

"But something is hampering this. And what is it? The U.S. policy of nonrecognition. One cannot, as it were, retreat from this because otherwise, on that ship by that island in the Mediterranean, an agreement could be concluded quietly, just as Ribbentrop and Molotov came to an agreement on the destinies of the Baltic states.

"I do hope that such a possibility is excluded. But somewhere such analogies exist—it hampers the great powers of the world in consistently forming these good relations, because, as we observed during the conference, everything was fine, everybody was smiling, but as soon as the Baltic region came up, the Soviet representatives began to hedge the Americans began to whistle". This situation, he says, enabled him to conclude that after this, the fifth meeting, the next meeting could perhaps be organized by the USSR and the United States on the Baltic question. A stuck fishbone cannot be swallowed, it must be extracted. Solving this question, Birkavs says, is necessary for the further normal development of both the great powers, and this has been properly solved by those Soviet and U.S. politicians who had replied that this was a question for the Baltic peoples themselves. And if it is left for the Baltic peoples to decide, it is clearly known what the Baltic peoples will do. As I said on U.S. television, Birkavs concludes, these would be relations between a free Latvia and a free Soviet Union.

China

USSR-PRC Exchanges in November Reviewed

OW0412140489 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 30 Nov 89

["A Record of Soviet-Chinese Exchanges," from the "Current Events and Commentaries" program]

[Text] In November, the Soviet Union, as well as many other countries in the world, celebrated the October Revolution. China also held various activities. The Chinese People's Association for Friendship with Foreign Countries and the China-USSR Friendship Association cosponsored a cocktail party in Beijing to celebrate the anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

The renowned Chinese opera vocalist Zhong Lei gave a recital on the October Revolution at the Beijing Concert Hall. The vocalist, who studied at the Department of Vocal Music of the Moscow Music Academy during the 1950's, sang songs by Russian composers. A Soviet film week held in Beijing and a Soviet television week in Shanghai brought some popular Soviet programs to Chinese audiences.

In November, we also saw that 6 months had elapsed since Soviet leader Gorbachev's historic visit to China. The visit signified the complete normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations and culminated in the restoration of ties between the CPSU and the CPC. In November, another big step was taken toward the realization of the agreement reached in Beijing. Diplomatic and military experts of the Soviet Union and China held the first round of talks in Moscow from 13 to 27 November to discuss troop reductions on the Soviet-Chinese border and the enhancement of confidence in military affairs. During the talks, the two sides unanimously held that reducing troops on the border and enhancing trust between the two countries is of great significance for developing goodneighborly relations between them.

A Soviet delegation, headed by Minister of Trade Terekh, visited China in November. The visit gave a strong impetus to bilateral trade. At the same time, the two sides expressed the belief that much remains to be explored in further expanding trade.

A Heilongjiang provincial delegation, led by Governor Shao Qihui, paid a visit to the Soviet Union in November. The delegation visited the Maritime Province, some cities in Siberia, and Moscow. During talks with officials of the Soviet frontier bordering China, the Chinese visitors discussed concrete measures for increasing cooperation. In Moscow, the Chinese delegation was met by Vlasov, chairman of the Council of Minister of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic. A number of agreements were signed after the meeting.

Cooperation in education has also been expanding. Professors of (Tunnesk) Engineering Institute resumed contacts with Chinese scholars for the first time in 3 decades. Many Chinese senior engineers graduated from this institute. The institute signed a cooperation agreement with the Shenyang Engineering College. Under the agreement, which was proposed by the Chinese side, the two sides will extensively exchange experience in metallurgy, computer technology, and energy. Soviet and Chinese experts will cooperate not only in conducting scientific research, but also in exploring new teaching methods.

A Chinese delegation from the Xinjiang Uigur Autonomous Regional Education Commission visited Alma-Ata, capital of Kazakh SSR. During the visit, an agreement on cooperation in training experts was signed.

Seismologists from Kirghizia and Xinjiang began joint research on predicting earthquakes in the Tianshan area. A joint committee on the research has been set up. During their talks, Soviet and Chinese scholars discussed short- and long-term cooperation plans until 1995.

Finally, please listen to the following news in brief:

- A Sino-Soviet textile joint venture has been set up in Xinjiang's Shihezi City.
- A delegation from Kurgan in Khazak SSR visited Jiangsu and signed an agreement with the Yangcheng Radio Plant on supplying a cassette recorder production line for Kurgan.
- A Soviet children's book fair was held in Beijing, during which beautifully designed and written books by major Soviet publishing houses were displayed.

China, USSR Establish 'First' Joint Venture

SK1811092389 Harbin Heilongjiang Provincial Service in Mandarin 1000 GMT 16 Nov 89

[Text] The Irkutsk Joint Health Hospital, the first joint venture established by our country and the Soviet Union, opened in Irkutsk in the Soviet Union yesterday. This Chinese-Soviet joint hospital was coestablished by the Harbin Foreign Railway Economic and Technological Cooperation Company, the Central Siberia Branch of the Academy of Science and Technology of the Soviet Union, and the Clinical Medical Hospital of Irkutsk Oblast.

The period for cooperation is 10 years. According to a contract for the cooperation, China sends 40 experts in traditional Chinese medicine to treat Russian patients through nonmedicinal methods, and the Soviet side provides housing and medical equipment. So far, the first group of Chinese medical experts, totaling 15, and 3 working personnel have begun work there.

The Russian people showed great interest in traditional Chinese medical treatment, and came in endless streams to receive treatment.

Sino-Soviet Joint Venture Set for Beijing

OW0412035689 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0600 20 Nov 89

[Excerpts] The work for establishing the first Sino-Soviet joint venture plant will soon come to an end. Station reporter (Machinko) reports. [passage omitted]

The technique of titanium nitrite ionization coating, code name (po bo de), was the invention of the Soviet Academy of Sciences. [passage omitted]

The Sino-Soviet joint venture plant will produce the (po bo de) products by using the Soviet invention. (Wang Zhailu), scientist and general manager of the Beijing Great Wall Technology Company, was the initiator who proposed the establishment of this joint venture. Let us listen to (Wang Zhailu) on the future of this joint venture.

[Begin (Wang Zhailu) recording] This joint venture was set up by the High Temperature Research Institute of the Soviet Academy of Sciences in the Beijing Haidian New Technology Development Zone. At present, this joint venture is the first of its kind jointly established in Beijing by China and a socialist country. There are still many unknowns ahead. We still have a lot to learn. But, I think we can run it well, because during the course of contacts, the atmosphere was very good. Both sides have a very strong and friendly willingness to cooperate. [End of recording]

(Wang Zhaolu) is a well-established entrepreneur. The company he leads has become a big company in recent years, engaged in large-scale international trading. Buyers from the United States, Japan, and Southeast Asian countries like to buy from his company. This year, it has earned nearly $1 million in profits in foreign exchange. The business has been good and the future is bright. However, the future of this company lies in cooperation with the Soviet Union. (Wang Zailu) tells us why.

[Begin (Wang Zailu) recording] I think there are two reasons for setting up a joint venture with our Soviet friends. The first is our friendship with the Soviet friends. We are willing and happy to cooperate with our Soviet friends. I have a special feeling for the Soviet Union. [passage omitted] Another reason is that the Soviet Union has a very good foundation in (words indistinct) technology. The cooperation will boost our strength. We have not enough strength to single-handedly market our products abroad. With friends, we can market our products abroad together. Our production scale will be expanded. At first glance, profits seem cut in half; as a matter of fact, we earn more profits than by going it alone. Therefore, from the economic point of view, the cooperation is beneficial to both sides. [End recording]

Lastly, I would like to say that an agreement to establish a joint venture in Beijing will be signed next month. The first batch of products will be out by the spring of 1990.

Heilongjiang Delegation Ends Visit to Leningrad

OW0212130589 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 20 Nov 89

[Text] The Heilongjiang Provincial Government delegation visiting the USSR at the invitation of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic [RSFSR] Council of Ministers concluded its 2-day visit to Leningrad on 19 November.

During his last meeting with Zubkov, first chairman of the Leningrad Oblast Executive Committee, Shao Qihui, governor of the Heilongjiang Provincial People's Government, expressed the hope that Heilongjiang and Leningrad Oblast would continue to develop their fruitful and beneficial ties and reciprocal cooperation. The Chinese visitors said emphatically that there are great possibilities in these fields.

The Heilongjiang delegation returned to Moscow on the same day.

On Monday, Shao Qihui and Vlasov, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee [title as heard] and chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, signed a document on RSFSR-Heilongjiang cooperation in 1990-91.

Northeast Asia

Kornilov on Relations With South Korea

LD0512092689 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0725 GMT 5 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow 5 Dec (TASS)—TASS Political Observer Yuriy Kornilov writes:

President No Tae-u of South Korea told journalists in Paris that in light of Seoul's successful efforts in developing ties with Hungary, Poland and other socialist countries, progress in relations between South Korea and the USSR will be achieved earlier than had been expected. According to No Tae-u, "the establishment of diplomatic relations between Seoul and Moscow seems totally feasible."

I am not going to analyze here Seoul's relations with various East European and other states; each country has a complete and sovereign right to establish diplomatic and other ties with whomsoever it deems it necessary.

However, since No Tae-u touched upon relations between South Korea and the USSR, it is worth recalling that our country's line on the Korea question has not been reviewed and remains unchanged. Guided in its foreign policy by the principles of new political thinking, the USSR has established and is developing economic, cultural, sporting, and other ties with South Korea on a nongovernmental level. As far as I know, the need for establishing official diplomatic relations with South Korea is not being examined in the USSR as a pressing task.

In his address No Tae-u also touched upon the political situation on the Korean Peninsula. In this connection, I would recall that the "Korean knot"—as has already been stated on more than one occasion in Moscow—gives rise to concern among the Soviet public. Many proposals about how this knot could be untied have been made by the DPRK Government. These proposals are supported in the Soviet Union, where it is stressed that the main thing is to actively assist dialogue between North and South Korea.

KCNA Cited on Polish-South Korean Ties

90UI0118A Moscow TRUD in Russian 10 Nov 89 p 3

[Unattributed report: "Two Viewpoints"]

[Text] **"Economic laws have broken down the ideological wall"—this was how PAP commented on the establishment of full diplomatic relations between Poland and**

South Korea. The signing in Seoul by a Polish Government delegation of trade agreements inaugurates a new stage in the two countries' cooperation.

Poland has opportunities to expand exports to South Korea of raw materials, chemical semimanufactures, and farm products. In turn, Poland is interested in imports from South Korea of technology and science-intensive products. There are real opportunities for the creation of joint ventures, particularly in the sphere of the tourist industry.

Commenting on this event, KCNA (Pyongyang) observes that a change in power occurred in Poland as a consequence of "the ideological and cultural penetration of imperialism, and in this situation Poland is attempting to find a way out of the crisis in the establishment of diplomatic relations with the South Korean puppets, who are incapable of living without the support of U.S. imperialism and Japanese reaction." Poland's foreign debt is currently put at tens of billions of dollars. This, KCNA believes, is the disastrous consequence of predatory aid on the part of the imperialists. The present decision to establish diplomatic relations runs counter to the development of friendly relations between the peoples of the DPRK and Poland, the commentary observes.

New South Korean Rightist Group Examined

PM0412150989 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 30 Nov 89 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Extreme Right Unites"]

[Text] Tokyo 29 Nov—A new right-wing grouping is being formed in South Korea. As YONHAP reports, around 50 retired generals, former cabinet members, and representatives of business circles held a second meeting in preparation for the creation of an organization under the name "Council of the Pandemocratic Movement for the Implementation of Reforms." The creators of the new grouping themselves characterize it as a "conservative right-wing civil movement" which, according to their intentions, will be called on to "protect liberal democracy and root out left-wing forces."

One of the main initiators of the organization is former Minister of Government Administration Kim Yong-kap, whom Japan's KYODO has characterized as "a hawk among hawks" and who professes extreme right-wing views.

Observers express the opinion that the formation of the grouping, which is expected to be announced in February of next year, may lead to increased pressure from the right on the South Korean president's administration and on the leader of the ruling Democratic Justice Party No Tae-u, and as a result, the incipient process of democratization will be undermined.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

48 Soviet Nationals 'In Danger' in Manila

HK0512031989 Moscow in Tagalog to the Philippines 1300 GMT 4 Dec 89

[Text] Fighting between government troops and rebel soldiers is continuing in Manila, but the Aquino Government has announced that the situation is under control. Reports say troops loyal to the government have deployed tanks and armored personnel carriers which continue to track the rebels down in many residential areas. Countless civilians have been affected by the fighting. The rebels have declared that they are prepared to die and that they plan to take foreigners hostage.

In this connection, 48 Soviet citizens who live near the area involved in the fighting are believed to be in danger because of the rebel attacks. At present, Moscow is in direct communication with its personnel in the Soviet Embassy in Manila who are in a safe condition.

Meanwhile, an official spokesman of the Ninoy Aquino International Airport said that flight operations have returned to normal. This was reported by AGENCE FRANCE PRESSE. The airport was shut down on Friday at the start of the coup d'etat.

Meanwhile, reports say that two colonels of the Philippine Armed Forces have been arrested for involvement in the initial attack.

Manila Situation, U.S. Involvement Viewed

PM0412170589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Dec 89 Second Edition p 6

[Report by own correspondent D. Kolsyrev: "Rebellion Time"]

[Excerpts] Manila—At midnight on 1 December there were sounds of gunfire, at first resembling New Year fireworks. But then the street began to shudder beneath the weight of tanks. The crudely painted letters on their sides left no doubt to whom they belonged: They were the forces of "RAM," or the Reform the Armed Forces Movement of the Philippine military's underground organization, mounting another coup against President Aquino's constitutional regime. [passage omitted]

It is difficult to say at the moment what conclusions the authorities will draw from what has happened. It seems the chief problem at the moment is the military department, in which plots are constantly brewing. The very department, incidentally, which is actually controlling the situation in the country today. Not for nothing did the state's leaders, addressing a news conference 2 days ago, say that according to the law the military judges the military (hinting at the extreme leniency shown by military courts to people involved in previous plots), while Senator B. Aquino, brother of the current president's late husband, said that it is time to introduce the death penalty for mutineers.

President Aquino, who appeared on television many times during the difficult period while fighting was in progress, once again showed the country how calm and courageous she is when the going is tough. The Filipinos, who were all but in the clutches of a dictatorship, now have a chance to ponder the fact that democracy is a priceless asset and it must be preserved even if many people are unhappy with the administration or the legislative authorities. During the difficult hours there were television reports to the effect that many ordinary citizens—truck and bus drivers—had started to build barricades with their vehicles at major intersections and points of entry into the capital, thus blocking the putchists' path.

I remember the grim Friday morning in Manila when it appeared that the regime's future was hanging by a thread. The streets were as quiet as the grave and there was no television.... At mid-day the mood changed radically. There were merry pre-New Year programs on the radio again, interspersed with bulletins. Although at that time none of the rebels had actually surrendered. What was the reason for the sudden change of mood?

The rebellion began with the capture of a Philippine Air Force base, and government aircraft in the capital were unable to take off: The runways were under fire. Some putschist aircraft starting bombing the presidential palace and the television studio.... Then the president agreed to ask the Americans for help. Phantom aircraft were sent from nearby Clark U.S.Air Force Base. It was said at the news conference that they did not intend and were unable (for purely technical reasonsa) to carry out real combat actions. They circled above the capital and above the places where the fiercest fighting was taking place. Rebel aircraft were shot down by the Filipinos themselves. But it was the appearance of the Phantoms that had the requisite psychological effect.

Opinions about this vary. Some people are already protesting about this action, calling it interference.

U.S. Claimed Reneging on Philippine Bases Payment

HK0312125589 Moscow in Tagalog to the Philippines 1300 GMT 2 Dec 89

[Commentary by Anatoliy Aleksandrov]

[Text] Worries have been expressed over the coming negotiations for the U.S. military bases in the Philippines. Secretary of Foreign Affairs Raul Manglapus says that the U.S. Government has still not fulfilled three articles in an agreement signed in 1988 dealing with payments by the Americans for their use of Philippine territory for Clark Air Base and Subic Naval Base during the past 2 years. This involves no small amount. The U.S. agreed to pay the Philippines $480 million each year, however Manila fears that payments for the past 2 years will not be made. The Philippines badly needs the funds to help pay its large foreign debt, which amounts to $28 billion.

During the time the U.S. military bases have been in the Philippines, many Filipinos have pinned their hopes on the payments owed them, as well as on the jobs which are provided to a large number of people. In terms of supplying produce to the bases, profits made from these amount to $240 million. This means that the U.S. is the seventh largest country trading with the Philippines, according to the American Chamber of Commerce, with 80,000 Filipinos working in the bases.

The dollars earned from the two military bases mainly benefit the towns close to the bases. The continued presence of the bases also assures Japanese businessmen in the Philippines of continued profits. Therefore, the almighty greenback is very powerful. However more and more Filipinos are saying that these bases should be removed, since they are worried about the presence of nuclear weapons which has been a topic of discussion during the bases negotiations. They believe that the continued presence of the bases means the continued influence of Washington in the economic and political life of the Philippines.

Two legislators who originally opposed the bases are Senators Wigberto Tanada and Joseph Estrada, and in the Lower House, Congresswoman Nikki Coseteng. They believe that in all the time that the military bases have been in the country, the Americans have abused the country and violated its sovereignty. Joining these legislators are other groups opposing the military bases who are calling for the peaceful uses of the bases once the Americans leave the Philippines. Plans are to turn Clark Air Base into an international airport, while Subic Naval Base will be turned into a trade zone. Active calls for these have prompted the Aquino government to set up a commission to study the alternative uses for these military facilities.

According to a survey carried out in Manila, many Filipinos oppose the retention of the U.S. military bases because of the continued political interference in the country. Therefore negotiations on this will indicate whether relations between the U.S. and the Philippines remain attractive.

It must be pointed out that many Filipinos, especially those who live far from Luzon, do not know much about the bases. It is therefore not hard to guess what the result will be if a referendum on this is carried out. Such a referendum is being suggested for after the talks between Manila and Washington take place. Many senators are known to oppose the holding of such a referendum. They are also known to oppose the retention of the military bases and have said they will do everything in their power to prevent the signing of a new agreement. Ratification of such an agreement would require a two-thirds vote from the Senate.

Moves are now underway in certain quarters to try to convince the senators to change their positions. This was made clear after the visit by President Aquino to the United States, during which it was announced that

financial assistance to Manila would depend on whether the U.S. military bases will be allowed to stay in the country. President Bush declared that this was the only way to convince U.S. congressmen to approve the new financial assistance to Manila.

It is therefore possible to see what the results of the coming negotiations to be held in Manila will be. Many Filipino legislators are calling for a reduction of tension in the region, such as is taking place today in various parts of the world.

Senator Leticia Ramos Shahani has said that the military bases are no longer needed because cold war thinking is no longer valid. However, as we can see in the Philippines, the agenda for the negotiations with the Americans about their bases will include financial assistance. If we consider what Secretary Raul Manglapus, who will lead the Philippine panel, has said about Washington not abiding by its earlier agreement, we can see which direction these talks will take.

Philippine Case Against Westinghouse Analyzed

HK2011045389 Moscow in Tagalog to the Philippines 1300 GMT 18 Nov 89

[Commentary by Anatoliy Alexandrov]

[Text] A local court in New Jersey has summoned Philippine Vice President Salvador Laurel, opposition minority leader Juan Ponce Enrile, and three former government officials to give evidence dealing with the Manila Government's action against the U.S. company Westinghouse.

The Philippine Government is suing Westinghouse, which supplied material for the Bataan Nuclear Power Plant. The contract was signed during the Marcos administration, allowing the company to set up of a nuclear reactor for the power plant. Another U.S. company, Barnes and Rowe, was involved in the construction of the plant. The two contractors revised certain technical standards which violated the safety rules as laid down by International Atomic Energy Agency. In view of this, the Philippine Government has shelved the project until the entire issue is clarified.

Let us ponder the meaning of this event, especially if we consider the immensity of the embezzlement involved in such a project—more than $2 billion. This is why the Philippines is suing Westinghouse for the exorbitant amount involved in setting up the power plant.

It will be recalled that the Philippines obtained a foreign loan for this project amounting to $2.2 billion. To date, over $300 million has been spent just to pay for the interest on the loan. Instead of producing energy, this plant has consumed several hundred thousands of dollars each year.

The situation is certainly a dramatic one. As it has turned out, the construction of this Bataan Nuclear Power Plant has served to swell the Philippines' foreign debt—a debt which today amounts to $28 billion.

Luzon's energy needs alone cannot be met. On the other hand, the U.S. military bases are consuming a huge amount of energy at both Subic Bay and Clark Field, which are not far from the nuclear power plant itself.

The energy shortage is now being felt on the island of Luzon, thus hindering the process of industrialization. So, several companies have set up their own electric power generators.

But the question remains: why did that contract fall into the hands of the Westinghouse Company? It is being posited in the Philippines that this would not have happened if the Marcos administration had not been bribed. It is because of this that the Philippine Government is now suing the company. Once the case is settled, the Philippines stands to gain compensation amounting to between $2.2 and $6.6 billion. So the New Jersey court is handling the largest ever case in the world at this time.

Because of the problems involving the Bataan Nuclear Power Plant, the Philippine Government is seeking other ways in which to obtain energy. Such a move means that the country will have to ask for further foreign loans. The Asian Development Bank recently decided to grant a $160 million loan towards this end.

So what will be the future of this Bataan Nuclear Power Plant? Will some of its equipment be sold? Or will it be converted into a thermal plant? None of this is certain, because the issue of the controversy involving Westinghouse has still not been resolved.

Near East & South Asia

Israeli Land Reclamation Raises Interest at Fair

TA2911133289 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1300 GMT 29 Nov 89

[Text] Israel participated for the first time in an international technological fair in Moscow this week, and was invited to take part in similar fairs to be held there in 1990.

Our correspondent Menahem Friedman reports that the exhibition in the Israeli pavilion focused on land reclamation and aroused much interest. Sources at the Ministry of Industry and Trade believe that Israel may be able to sell land reclamation equipment to the Soviet Union if the matter is handled by barter companies capable of financing the transactions.

Commentary on Mid-Term Majlis Elections in Iran

NC3011180189 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1500 GMT 30 Nov 89

[Yuriy Andreyev commentary from "The World Today" feature]

[Text] Dear listeners, the registration of the names of candidates for the mid-term Majlis elections in Iran has ended. These elections are to be held on 15 December. Residents of many parts of the country and namely the capital, will elect nine new Majlis deputies. Our commentator Yuriy Andreyev writes:

The registration of the names of candidates started in six constituencies for the upcoming parliamentary elections in the Islamic Republic a week ago. The Iranian Majlis has a total of 270 seats, 9 of which are empty now. As you know, 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani and three of his ministers who were Tehran deputies, resigned from their posts as deputies on the basis of the Constitution. The winners of the upcoming elections will fill Tehran seats.

Presently, as stated by the head of the Interior Ministry's elections' committee, the study of the competence of the candidates has ended. The names of all the 43 candidates who have been allowed to participate in the elections have been published in the press. Meanwhile, it seems that all the candidates have not been registered by the government officials. For example, it was reported a few days ago that 32 people from Tehran asked to participate in the elections. However, the names of only 22 people appeared in the official list published in the press. This list included the names of many well-known political figures, including six former ministers of the Musavi cabinet.

As expected, Ahmad Khomeyni will not participate in the upcoming elections. He was recently appointed as Ayatollah 'Ali Khamene'i's personal representative in the Supreme Council for National Security. Thus, according to facts, Ahmad Khomeyni will not claim any parliamentary positions, at least in the near future.

Meanwhile, this does not mean that the Khomeyni family is not participating in the election campaign. Reports indicate that Mrs Zahra, the daughter of the demised Imam, is running for a seat. It is interesting to note that this dynamic woman has recently been participating very actively in the country's political life. Currently she heads the Islamic Republic's Women's Organization which heads the women's movement within an official framework. Events show that this organization practically defends the government's social world outlook and propagates its policy among Iranian women.

It is difficult to know the extent of Mrs Zahra's popularity. However, she undoubtedly enjoys the support of government officials.

Meanwhile, there are persons among the candidates who had to resign from their government posts after 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani won the presidential elections. First and foremost, reference should be made to former Interior Minister 'Ali Akbar Mohtashami. He was not included in the new government, despite the fact that more than 100 Majlis deputies had sent a letter to the president requesting that Mohtashami retain his position.

Many Iranian newspapers believe that 'Ali Akbar Mohtashami has a good chance of winning in the Majlis elections.

Among the other relatively influential candidates, one can refer to former ministers Reza Akrami, Abolqasem Sarhaddizadeh, and Behzad Nabavi.

In short, we should probably expect a relatively strong pre-election campaign. But many foreign observers point out that there are not many true differences among the candidates, and it is some time now that the majority of the Iranians have realized the direction in which the wind of politics is blowing.

Human Rights Committee Invited to Tehran

NC3011174389 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1100 GMT 30 Nov 89

[Yuriy Andreyev commentary from the "On the Waves of Radio Moscow" feature]

[Text] Dear listeners, Kamal Kharrazi, Iran's representative to the United Nations, has sent a special letter to the UN Human Rights Committee inviting a representative of this international organization to visit Tehran. Our commentator Yuriy Andreyev comments on this report:

This is the first time that Iran, which has been criticized in the United Nation's human rights' reports, is inviting a UN representative on human rights issues to visit Iran. It seems that (Renaldo Galindo Pol), expert of the international organization who is monitoring the situation in the Islamic Republic, will arrive in Tehran soon.

It is understandable that this invitation is not accidental in any way. The UN Human Rights Committee is expected to publish its final report together with a study of the human rights situation in February 1990. Meanwhile, some foreign observers believe that the preliminary assessments by this committee are extremely unfavorable for Iran. It is under such conditions that the Iranian leadership has decided to facilitate (Renaldo Pol's) visit to Iran so that—as stated in Kamal Kharrazi's letter—he can compile his personal view on the basis of realities and not on the basis of baseless allegations.

The UN expert is to arrive in Tehran with his personal translator and to have the freedom of movement in the country and to meet with any Iranian citizen he wants to. The Iranian Government has undertaken a commitment to the world forum not to take any punitive measure against witnesses who give evidence to (Renaldo Pol).

On the basis of existing facts, Iranian officials are very worried about the Islamic Republic's political face on the international scene. I wish to recall that previously they very unexpectedly allowed foreign correspondents to visit Evin prison.

Meanwhile, the TEHRAN TIMES has published a report speaking of the very good condition of prisoners. Moreover, it is pointed out that such conditions do not exist in any country of the world. Frankly speaking, most of the correspondents regard this visit to the so-called model prison suspiciously. This visit did not have any serious political impacts. But this did not worry the Iranian officials who insisted on carrying out their program. In late October, a decree pardoning a large number of prisoners was published in Tehran. This decree included opponents of the regime who have repented. Despite this and even after the official step, 900 political prisoners continue to be imprisoned in Iran and this is a source of serious concern among the world's public.

The United Nations hopes that (Renaldo Pol's) visit to Iran will help to study reports by Iranian opposition organizations on the trampling on human rights.

Need for Persian Gulf Cooperation Stressed

NC0312091189 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Persian to Iran 1530 GMT 2 Dec 89

[Station commentary]

[Text] An international conference on Persian Gulf problems, which was attended by 400 Iranian and foreign experts, has been held in Tehran. Commenting on why the conference was held, Hojjat ol-Eslam 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani pointed out: Our country is ready to participate in building a better future for coming generations by cooperating with our neighbors and we hope that these neighbors will reciprocate.

I think that it is very important how the participants in the conference focused their attention on the search for ways to achieve understanding and cooperation among the Persian Gulf littoral states. This Tehran conference was much better than many similar conferences held in the past, where the main focus was to discredit Iraq and the other governments with which Iran did not have good relations. One cannot limit one's acts to propaganda.

The cease-fire on the Iran-Iraq front has placed many challenges before the Iranian leadership in the postwar phase. A considerable number of houses, economic installations, and schools were damaged during the war and need to be reconstructed and rennovated. The country must end its economic stagnation and its people's hopes for a better life must be fulfilled. The country must emerge from its international isolation and make use of foreign experiences and technology as well as international trade to accelerate social and economic growth.

Expanding commercial and economic relations with neighoring Arab countries which offer vast markets for Iranian products and which have large amounts of capital and their own high-quality products should play a basic role. The participants in the Tehran conference pointed out that there are favorable grounds for cooperation among Persian Gulf littoral states. Geographic proximity, shared traditions, Islam, and membership in OPEC are all factors that unite them. The threats faced by all the regional countries both collectively and individually dictates the need for cooperation.

At the same time, the conflicts which have been maintained among the Persian Gulf littoral states, conflicts which are exploited by opposing foreign forces, cannot be ignored. Self-interest within OPEC and rivalry between Iran and Saudi Arabia for leadership of the Islamic world, coupled with the Arabs' concern over Iran's claims to act as the regional superpower, all exist. However, the major factor preventing the solution of all problems is the continuing tension between Iran and Iraq. The shuttle dimplomacy of UN envoy Jan Eliasson, who tried to convince Tehran and Baghdad to continue the peace talks, was unable to remove this tension. The heart of the problem is that the two sides cannot reach agreement on sovereignty over the Shatt al-'Arab or Arvand River. Both sides insist on their own views on the river's borders. Disputes over the delineation of the river's border indicate that a spirit of confrontation has been maintained on both sides since the war.

I think that the time has come for past approaches to be changed radically. The time has come for daring and (?responsible) decisions to be adopted to benefit peace and goodneighborliness.

During the Tehran conference, the Soviet Union's role in the Persian Gulf was positively assessed. In the final report by Iranian Foreign Minister 'Ali Akbar Velayati, it was pointed out that Moscow is not interested in interfering in the domestic affairs of Persian Gulf littoral states. This assessment once again confirms that the objective of the Soviet Union's foreign policy in the Persian Gulf is not in conflict with the interests of peace and goodneighborliness among the nations of the region.

Moscow Views Results of OPEC Conference

NC3011220389 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1100 GMT 30 Nov 89

[Aleksandr Batyev commentary from "On the Waves of Radio Moscow" feature—recorded passages in quotation marks]

[Text] Marked progress was made during the 86th OPEC conference and agreement was reached on new oil production quotas starting in January 1990. The new quota has been increased by 1.5 million barrels to 122 million barrels a day. The petroleum and energy ministers of 12 OPEC members welcomed this agreement. The stand of the UAE which—as before—insists on doubling its quota continues to be ambiguous. We asked our analyst Aleksandr Batyev to comment on the results of the Vienna conference.

[Batyev in Russian, with Persian superimposed] "On the eve of the Vienna conference it was anticipated that the

general volume of oil extraction in the OPEC member nations be increased in a new agreement on oil quotas, and that the quotas, too, be distributed differently. Iran, which wanted an increase in the quotas of Kuwait and of the UAE at the expense of Saudi Arabia, submitted proposals on this.

"Experts' forecasts were generally proven correct. The volume of oil extraction was increased and the division of quotas was revised. But this was done, not because of Iran's initiatives, but on the basis of joint proposals by Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and Iraq. For example, Kuwait's quota increased at Indonesia's expense. The Indonesian petroleum minister agreed with this because, as he confessed, his country is unable to extract the quantity of oil foreseen in the OPEC quota. Meanwhile, Kuwait can easily extract more oil than foreseen in its quota. An anonymous Iranian representative said in an interview with THE NEW YORK TIMES that such a revision in quotas can, at first glance, appear to be an unimportant phenomenon because a precedence is set according to which quotas in OPEC are divided not because of political reasons or prestige, but on the basis of the oil resources of each country and of its technical possibilities to extract oil.

"A more decisive revision of quota divisions which may raise complaints may take place in the 1990's. This process will mean that the so-called group of the big five in the Persian Gulf—Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Iraq, the UAE, and Iran—will adopt a leadership role in OPEC, both in pricing and in the setting of extraction volumes."

[Announcer] But all these are far in the future. Let us discuss nearer outlooks and the impact the permissible increase in the volume of oil extraction in OPEC will have on world prices.

[Batyev] "Most observers believe that prices will not change considerably for the time being. And if oil prices suddenly fall, the OPEC petroleum ministers will have to meet in March under this agreement in order to take the necessary steps to maintain prices on the current level—that is, $18 a barrel. After all, events will show what the situation will be like. But the noteworthy point now is that the successful compilation of the new agreement was, from many aspects, the outcome of the constructive participation by both Iran and Iraq. For example, Tehran did not insist obstinately on the acceptance of its proposals which were propounded on the eve of the Vienna conference and it agreed to support the proposals tendered by Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and Iraq.

"It should be noted that Iran's relations with these countries and especially with Iraq are not very good in any way. Nevertheless, as observers point out, Iran and Iraq were on the verge of a joint action, especially on the issue of increasing the Persian Gulf countries' influence in OPEC. Therefore, when the issue is one of important vital issues—and these issues are definitely oil issues for both Iran and Iraq—both countries find a way to cooperate. The question is: Why haven't these two countries been able to find a common language on ending the war between them until now? Don't Tehran and Baghdad consider this to be among significant and vital issues?"

Supreme Soviet Delegation Departs Syria

LD0512094389 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1210 GMT 4 Dec 89

[Text] Damascus, 4 Dec (TASS)—The visit to the Syrian Arab Republic [SAR] by a delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet led by A.M. Masaliyev, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet and first secretary of the Communist Party of Kirghizia Central Committee, is over. The delegation was here from 27 November to 4 December inclusive at the invitation of the People's Assembly (parliament) of the SAR.

The delegation was given a warm, friendly reception. The members of the delegation were received by Hafiz al-Asad, secretary general of the Arab Socialist Ba'th Party and president of the SAR, to whom a message from M.S. Gorbachev was conveyed, which was received with gratitude. The delegation had meetings with A.Q. Qaddurah, speaker of the People's Assembly, with Faruq al-Shar', minister of foreign affairs, and other representatives of the Syrian leadership, and with scientific and cultural figures.

The delegation visited the town of Qunaytirah, barbarically destroyed by the Israeli occupation, and became acquainted with the fruits of the joint labor of Soviet and Syrian experts in the field of power engineering, land reclamation, and transport.

During the talks there was an exchange of opinion on the international situation, the situation in the region, and on opportunities for the parliamentarians of the two countries to ensure stability and security in the world. The sides noted that the cooperation of the parliamentarians of the two friendly countries was an important contribution to strengthening Soviet- Syrian relations, which were developing on the basis of the 1980 treaty of friendship and cooperation between the USSR and SAR.

A joint statement was adopted on the results of the visit.

Today the delegation of Soviet parliamentarians left for home.

Returns to Moscow

LD0512094689 Moscow TASS in English 0854 GMT 5 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 5 TASS—A delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet (parliament), led by Absamat Masaliyev, member of the USSR Supreme soviet and first secretary of the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee, returned to Moscow from Damascus on Monday night.

The delegation stayed in Syria from November 27 to December 4 at the invitation of the Syrian People's Council (parliament).

USSR, PDRY Exchange Greetings

LD2311233189 Moscow TASS in English 1330 GMT 22 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 22 TASS—The Soviet Union and the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen exchanged greetings marking the 10th anniversary of the treaty of friendship and cooperation between the two countries.

The Soviet message from the Communist Party Central Committee, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and the USSR Council of Ministers said that the past decade has proven the effectiveness of the treaty, which meets the vital interests of the two peoples and promotes international peace and security, as well as a just settlement and regional stability in the Middle East.

Friendly relations and broad cooperation between the Soviet Union and Democratic Yemen will hopefully continue to expand and benefit the two peoples, it said.

The message signed by the Central Committee of the Yemen Socialist Party, the Presidium of the Supreme People's Council, and the Council of Ministers said that the treaty symbolises the deep relations between the people of the two countries and embodies their desire to expand friendship and cooperation for the benefit of both peoples. It documents their noble support of the Arabs' struggle for freedom and promotes social progress, international peace and security.

Ministers Congratulate Indian Premier

PM0412155389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Dec 89 Second Edition p 5

["USSR Council of Ministers Congratulations to Indian Prime Minister"]

[Text] To Indian Prime Minister Mr Vishwanath Pratap Singh

Please accept our congratulations on your appointment as Indian prime minister.

The Soviet Union and India are linked by age-old ties of friendship and cooperation. Our two states are united by our lofty common aim of ensuring lasting peace and development for present and future generations. The complex of bilateral Soviet-Indian relations is operating successfully. Soviet-Indian political cooperation has become a weighty factor in world affairs.

We are convinced that the Soviet Union and India will continue to actively cooperate to build a new just and democratic world for everyone, a nuclear-free and nonviolent world, where every people will be ensured freedom of choice and the right to have this choice respected by others.

We wish you good health and success and we wish the friendly Indian people progress and prosperity.

The USSR Council of Ministers

Sub-Saharan Africa

Angola Protests U.S. Senators' Letter to Bush

PM0412151589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Nov 89 Second Edition p 4

[Own correspondent V. Tyurkin dispatch: "Laying the Blame at Someone Else's Door..."]

[Text] Luanda, 29 Nov—An attempt to mislead world public opinion—this is how ANGOP has described the message from a group of U.S. Senators to U.S. President G. Bush accusing the Angolan Government of allegedly blocking the peace settlement in the country and urging that the "situation in Angola" be included on the agenda of the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting.

The senators' petition, the commentary says, virtually lays the responsibility for the breakdown of talks at the door of Angola and the Soviet Union. Nothing could be farther from the truth. The Angolan Government, the agency points out, has always displayed flexibility, responsibility, and good will in order to resolve internal and regional problems by peaceful, comprehensive means. It is enough to mention the New York agreements on a settlement in Southwest Africa of which it is a signatory and which are scrupulously complied with. It was also responsible for the "peace plan" which met with support from the eight heads of state from Central and Southern Africa at the conference in Luanda, then from the 18 African presidents in Gbadolite (Zaire), and then from all the African OAU member-countries. Angola is still continuing to honestly seek ways leading to peace.

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, its contribution to the solution of world problems and universal disarmament has brought about irreversible positive changes and cannot be called into question at all, which cannot be said of the other side. Contrary to the agreements reached, the Republic of South Africa and the United States are still giving the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola comprehensive assistance. It is this kind of outside interference—of which the letter from the U.S. Senators may be considered an example—that is the main obstacle to peace.

Commentator on Coup Attempt in Comoros

EA2912201289 Moscow International Service in Swahili 1730 GMT 28 Nov 89

[From the "Day's Major Events" program]

[Text] Sunday night, there was a coup d'etat bid in the Federal Republic of Comoros in an attempt to overthrow the government. A group of Army troops penetrated the president's residence, which is located a few km from the country's capital, Moroni. During an exchange of fire,

Ahmed Abdallah Abderemane, the president of the Comoros, was killed. Our news commentator, (Aleksey Gregoriy) explains.

[Begin (Gregoriy) recording] Events in the Comoros have once again attracted the attention of the international community. Several questions arise concerning this small island, situated off the Mozambican coast. The most important of these questions is: Who would want to change the leadership in that republic?"

Only recently, there was a referendum, the result of which was that a great majority supported a change in the constitution to allow 70-year old President Ahmed Abdallah to contest the presidency in the next presidential elections again. Some light is shed on these events by AFP reports, according to which there was recently a power struggle between the Comoran Army and the Presidential Guard. The Comoran Army is thought to be equal in number—500 troops—but the Presidential Guard has been given much better relief services [as heard] and uses better equipment and uniforms than the regular Army troops.

As reported by AFP, troops from the Army were seen among those who directly participated in the overthrow of the government and destruction of the presidential residence. According to AFP, it is clear that the events in the Comoros are nothing more than a change of (?leaders). On the other hand, it might be supposed that the events have even deeper origins.

The Presidential Guard was set up on the proposal of Colonel Bob Denard, who has the worst reputation among mercenaries of this second half of the 20th Century. Bob Denard has long been a very important person and very highly paid in the (?Comoros Islands). He participated in the plots which saw the fall of Abdallah Abderemane after only 27 days in leadership after the independence of the Comoros from the French colonial masters on 6 July 1975. And it was Bob Denard who, after 3 years, returned him to the Presidency. (?The reward) given to Bob Denard for that good gesture was the post of chief of staff of the Comoran Armed Forces, plus invaluable and endless facilities.

He has lived in the Comoros for a long time. It is said that after getting very rich, he emigrated to South Africa. From then on, relations between the Comoros and South Africa started (?evolving) quickly. This is why Bob Denard is always remembered in most of the country's events.

As of now, it is difficult to tell what will become of the Comoros after this coup attempt aimed at overthrowing the government. For now, the acting head of state is the chief of the Supreme Court, (Haribou Chebani). In my view, the future outcome of the events will depend on those who succeed in securing the [words indistinct] either really patriotic people or those seeking only to fulfill personal interests. [end recording]

Yuliy Vorontsov Receives Ethiopian Envoy

PM3011132789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading: "Talks Held"]

[Text] USSR First Deputy Foreign Minister Yu.M. Vorontsov received Asrat Wolde, Ethiopian ambassador to the USSR, 27 November.

During a businesslike, friendly conversation questions of the further development of Soviet-Ethiopian relations were discussed and certain aspects of the domestic political situation in Ethiopia were touched upon.

CPSU Delegation Leaves for Cape Verde

PM2411150989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Nov 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report under the general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] A CPSU delegation headed by Yu.G. Samsonov, first secretary of the Ulyanovsk Oblast CPSU Committee and member of the USSR Supreme Soviet, left for Cape Verde 23 November. The delegation will also be visiting Guinea-Bissau.

East Europe

Poland's Rakowski Meets Yakovlev in Moscow

LD0412165789 Moscow TASS in English 1648 GMT 4 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 4 TASS—Aleksandr Yakovlev, a member of the Politburo and a secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, met with Mieczyslaw Rakowski, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers Party, today.

Rakowski is staying in Moscow at the invitation of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee.

During a friendly conversation, they discussed questions of the further perfection of inter-party cooperation between the Soviet Communist Party and the Polish United Workers Party, as well as some topical problems of Soviet-Polish relations.

Meets Hungary's Nemeth

LD0412212389 Warsaw PAP in English 1937 GMT 4 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow, Dec. 4—First Secretary of the Polish United Workers' Party (PUWP) CC [Central Committee] Mieczyslaw Rakowski, now on a visit to Moscow, met on Monday with Political Bureau member and secretary of the Communist Party of Soviet Union (CPSU) CC Aleksandr Yakovlev.

The sides pondered over how to improve cooperation between their two parties and discussed some aspects of the Soviet-Polish relations.

On the same day, Mieczyslaw Rakowski talked with Hungarian Prime Minister Miklos Nemeth.

Poland's Siwicki Visits, Meets Leaders

Meets With Yazov

LD0412144789 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1245 GMT 4 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow, 4 Dec. (TASS)—"Soviet-Polish relations are based on mutual respect for the sovereignty of our states, and help to solve the difficult tasks confronting the USSR and the Polish Peoples Republic," stated Army General Dmitriy Yazov, USSR minister of defense, in the course of a meeting today with Army General Florian Siwicki, minister of national defense of the Polish People's Republic, who is in the Soviet Union on an official visit.

Dmitriy Yazov commented that in the Soviet Union, General Siwicki's visit is regarded as a fresh confirmation of the firm bonds linking the peoples and armies of the USSR and Polish Peoples Republic. "We are convinced that this visit will serve further to enrich the cause of Soviet-Polish cooperation," he stressed.

General Florian Siwicki pointed out that all-round development and deepening of Soviet-Polish cooperation is one of the permanent strategic lines of the Peoples Polish Republic's foreign policy.

The guest from Poland later laid a wreath at the mausoluem of V.I. Lenin. A wreath was also laid at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier at the Kremlin Wall.

Received by Zaykov

LD0512152589 Moscow TASS in English 1456 GMT 5 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 5 TASS—Lev Zaykov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the Soviet Communist Party's Central Committee, today met Polish Defence Minister Florian Siwicki, in the USSR on an official visit.

They held a warm, friendly conversation on issues of Soviet- Polish cooperation.

Poland's Economic Future Remains in Doubt

90UI0150A Moscow TRUD in Russian 25 Nov 89 p 3

[Report by TRUD correspondent Yu. Skvortsov: "What Comes After the Abrupt Change"]

[Text] For several months now information on price increases has figured in practically all reports from Poland. There is no escaping this "tradition" today either, alas. Bus and streetcar fares have risen once again. The price of gasoline rises "smoothly" every Sunday. There are no lines in the food stores; there is as much meat as you could want because the price of it is such that many Poles cannot in the literal meaning of the words get their teeth into it.

In order to reduce the price of meat and milk, purchase tariffs were recently lowered. And the peasants found themslves in a most difficult situation: it is now unprofitable for them to sell their products; they are in a loss-making situation since the prices of farm machinery and the spares, therefore, have increased.

Increasingly new containers carrying meat are coming from the West "within the framework of gratis aid," but there is simply no getting hold of it. Some of these gifts have already been readdressed to Yugoslavia.

The republic's industry has not yet officially switched to market relationships—the central economic development plan will be canceled only as of January. But the plants and factories have, in fact, already left the planned track. There has been a decline in the amount of the manufactured product, and coal production has fallen. T. Mazowiecki, chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers, has appealed to the miners to work Saturdays. Otherwise the country will find itself during the winter without coal and heat. Understanding the entire complexity of the situation, the leaders of the class-based unions and "Solidarity" have agreed that the miners will work Saturday shifts. The Polish United Workers Party Central Committee Politburo has called on communists working in the mines to respond to the premier's request. Now is no time to gloat and recall that at a "roundtable" in the spring it was "Solidarity" which fiercely demanded, and got, "free Saturdays" for the miners. The concern now is not for political prestige but for how Poles will survive the cold.

Weather forecasts point to a bad winter with very low temperatures. Economists predict continuation of the recession and, consequently, low wages. Only the financial experts promise a continued rise—in prices. In other words, the winter forecasts for Poland are from all viewpoints very harsh.

The crisis is, naturally, being felt the most forcefully by the pensioners. The government has just raised the minimum pension to 102,000 zloty—approximately R90. This is good, but, all the same, not enough for meat, of course; a kilo costs almost R20...

Meanwhile, there is unending debate in the press on economic subjects. The transfer of the Polish economy to market principles is only a long-term goal as yet. A law on denationalization is only at the preparation stage, and organizations designed to break up the monopolies in industry and trade are only just beginning to be formed. But passions are already seething to the utmost around the government's intention of giving into private hands some of the plants and factories. Some people are ardently "for"—for new owners who will "kick all slackers and drunkards out of the shops." Others are just

as heatedly "against"—against the inevitable unemployment. Yet others are maintaining an Olympian calm, confident that all changes in the economic structure will not affect them personally. This situation has given birth to a joke even: Poles have contrived to breed a strain of mice which do not believe in the existence of the cat.

In short, the principles of the free market have yet to triumph in the Polish economy and have for this reason as yet had no effect. There is in the country an economic interregnum engendering lamentable national statistics and sorry personal arithmetic. All hopes are linked with 1990, all misgivings also.

The first results of the Polish restructuring, however, can be clearly seen in social and political life. Even those who recently were afraid to express their thoughts publicly now fear no one and nothing. People who were once kicked out of their jobs for their political views or trade union activity are now returning to the university departments and plant shops. Films that had been removed from the shelves are being shown in the movie theaters. Productions once removed from the stage have returned to the theaters. The newspaper stands are filled with new publications whose headlines contain by no means just the word "Solidarity." New parties and societies have emerged: liberals, socialists, Christian populists, conservatives, monarchists even... There is no law governing parties in the country as yet, and as yet only three parties operate officially. But in fact there is already room for everyone in public life. Respect the country's Constitution and its laws, and operate and win authority among the people.

But there have been losses, as is known, in democratic processes also. In a number of cities of the country members of the Confederation for an Independent Poland—an extremist nationalist group—resolved in the literal meaning of the word to fight for a place for themselves: They occupied others' premises and released them only several days later, following police intervention. And young supporters of the "Freedom and Peace" society recently staged on the streets of Gdansk a public burning of Russian textbooks. This action brought them no popularity; the first person to strictly condemn them was the local priest. The authors of numerous newspaper and magazine articles on the new stage of Polish-Soviet relations are unanimously agreed that the politicization of our relations entailed past economic and political losses in both countries. The opportunity and need for the establishment of normal friendly relations and for really becoming good neighbors have now arisen.

But where, for all that, is Poland heading? And what might await it beyond the abrupt change, which some call reform, others peaceful revolution, and yet others a return to capitalism? I shall not venture to answer such a question unequivocally today and caution others against such an attempt also. There is no need to rush to place a marker on an object which we ourselves do not yet know all that well...

Polish Deserters, Pacifists Pressure Sejm Deputies

PM0412160389 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 3 Dec 89 p 3

[Own correspondent V. Shutkevich dispatch: "I Am Not Happy To Serve—Or What the Hunger Strikers Outside the Polish Sejm Building Were Striving To Achieve"]

[Text] Warsaw—I recently met a deserter in Warsaw, a real one who had run away from the army. He was thin, unshaven, and melancholy, which is by and large not surprising for someone in his position.

The most paradoxical thing is that the deserter (hereafter I will call him by the name he used to introduce himself to me) did not think to hide himself. On the contrary, he made every effort to attempt to attract attention to himself, choosing virtually the most prominent site in Warsaw for this—Wiejska Street, outside the Polish Sejm building. Journalists constantly throng around here and parliamentary deputies pass by on their way to their sessions; even such popular figures as Walesa and Wajda appear from time to time. The deserter went on hunger strike to ensure that he would be noticed. But... he was not.

On the 9th day he was finally called to the Defense Ministry. Ministry officials probably also know that he had run away from the army but they preferred not to remind him of that. Which is, of course, in itself surprising... However, let us leave the irony and ask a serious question: What compelled this fellow to decide upon such a hard and—let's face it—quite risky step? His reasons were approximately the same as those of our young soldiers who run away from the army: a longing for civilian life, commanders' indifference and coarseness, and barracks-room bullying... Let me stipulate one thing straightaway: From what I have seen, the Polish Army is infected with this evil to a much lesser degree than ours. However, such cases do exist here too, and the deserter's fate is a graphic example of this. But what compelled other young people to join him?

They describe themselves as conscientious objectors [obzhektor]. Since Soviet readers are not as yet familiar with this term, we will try to explain what it means. In English a "conscientious objector" is someone who refuses active military service and refuses to take up weapons. Some people are supposedly prevented by their beliefs, others have chosen nonresistance as their moral principle, others simply do not want to spend their youth in a military barracks... You may encounter such people in virtually any country where there is general compulsory military service. The authorities are inevitably faced with the following question: What should be done with them? Should they be brought to trial? There would be too many of them.

In Poland, as in certain other states, an attempt has been made to solve this problem by giving conscientious objectors a choice: Either you serve with your contemporaries in some troop unit or you spend the prescribed

period doing menial jobs in the state sector—hospitals, old people's homes, municipal services, and so on. Admittedly, this period is 1 year longer than normal—so that it does not seem a soft option.

And it does not—not, at any rate, to the hunger strikers outside the Sejm building. First, they told journalists that they are often not sent where they should be. For instance, a guy from Krakow has to travel to Kolobrzeg for some incomprehensible reasons although the same work could probably also be found in his native city. Second, the conscientious objectors do not do jobs that they like or for which they have an aptitude. No account is taken of either their professional training or their level of education. Ridiculous situations occur whereby, for instance, a qualified pediatrician works in a hospital as a mere orderly and a graduate from a navigational college works as a truck gardener in the municipal services. Of course, someone has to do this work, but the country has an equal need of doctors and seamen. Third, unlike normal workers, a conscientious objector does not as a rule receive wages. All they received until recently was Z4,000 a month for working clothes and Z630 subsistence allowance. An ordinary loaf of bread in the stores now costs Z670!

In general, wherever you turn there is no happiness in the world. But there is peace and liberty, as our great classical writer rightly noted last century. Or, as applied to present-day Poland, there is "Wolnosc i Pokoj," a pacifist movement, people here believe, rallying all malcontents to its banner and organizing their hunger strike.

They first set about formulating specific claims against the authorities. An improvement in conscientious objectors' material conditions, which took into consideration the demands of most hunger strikers, was the first point. After talks with Minister J. Kuron, they were promised that the sum allocated to them each month for food and clothing would rise to Z118,500.

It proved more difficult to secure acceptance for demands concerning the outright deserter—that people like him be permitted free transition from active service to alternate work and that the length of this service be considerably reduced in both cases. This question concerns not only the security of Poland, but also that of the whole Warsaw Pact. And it is well known that T. Mazowiecki's government, which has the support of "Solidarity," has publicly said that it intends to adhere strictly to all its Warsaw Pact commitments.

This overt pressure jarred upon many members of parliament. By their foolhardiness the hunger strikers were accused of undermining the prestige and putting a spoke in the wheel of the new authorities. Senate Marshal Stelmachowski even described them angrily as a "gang of unshaven young oafs." In turn, the movement's activists also took umbrage. "Corporal Stelmachowski and Corporal Walesa have forgotten that, when needed, 'Wolnosc i Pokoj' always responded at the first call," A. Rogalia, one of the organizers of the hunger strike, said in the press. "But now they are sending us a little farther!" Evidently, the parliamentarians have suddenly thought that things are indeed looking bad. The hunger strikers have been given permission to use the toilets in the Sejm hotel and seek assistance from the first-aid point there. And Minister J. Kuron gave them $100 for subsistence and to buy mattresses. Then cold spells set in in Warsaw and the hunger strike was temporarily called off...

Where is the deserter now? Has he found peace and liberty, questions to which I have no answers? I am convinced of one thing alone: Pushkin by no means placed these words side-by-side by accident. There is no peace when there is no freedom. But without calm—that is, peace on our planet—there can be no real freedom.

CPSU Delegation Studies Polish Education

PM0412160289 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Dec 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Interparty Ties"]

[Text] In accordance with the plan for CPSU-Polish United Workers Party [PZPR] ties, a CPSU delegation headed by Comrade I.I. Nikishin, secretary of Stavropol Kray Party Committee, was in Poland 27 November through 2 December, studying the operation of the public education system in Poland.

The delegation was received by PZPR Central Committee Secretary S. Wiatr.

SED Central Committee Acknowledges Criticism

PM0412121389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Dec 89 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent M. Podklyuchnikov dispatch: "Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SED) Central Committee Resigns"]

[Excerpt] Berlin, 3 Dec—At its 12th plenum held today, the SED Central Committee unanimously adopted a decision to resign. A working commission is being set up to handle further preparations for the extraordinary party congress. A number of members of the former party leadership, including E. Honecker, W. Stoph, and H. Sindermann, have been expelled from the party.

Prior to the resignation of the SED Central Committee, its Politburo adopted a resolution which states that it agrees with the criticism from the majority of party members that the party leadership of the day proved incapable of exposing—in accordance with the instructions of the 9th and 10th Central Committee plenums—the full extent and seriousness of the misdemeanors of the former Politburo members and drawing the necessary conclusions from this. [passage omitted]

Commission To Guide SED, Prepare for Congress

LD0412122589 Moscow TASS in English 1157 GMT 4 Dec 89

[Text] Berlin December 4 TASS—In view of the resignation of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SED) Central Committee, a 25-member working commission has been formed for the further guidance of the party and preparation of an SED extraordinary congress scheduled for December 15-17.

The commission is headed by Herbert Kroker, leader of the Erfurt SED District Committee. Heinz Albrecht, Dieter Klein, and Eva Maleck-Lewy are his deputies.

When announcing the make-up of the commission at a meeting outside the SED Central Committee building, Gregor Gysi, a prominent lawyer, emphasised that no former Politburo members are on the commission.

The party congress, he said, should be prepared to give an impulse to the new government and the building of a new socialism.

He called on party members not to dodge responsibility for the destiny of the country and appealed to them not to resign from the party.

A commission was also formed to investigate violations of party rules and legality by former and incumbent SED functionaries. The commission is headed by Gysi.

In a related development, the NEUES DEUTSCHLAND newspaper was published today as a newspaper of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, and not as that of the SED Central Committee.

TASS Views GDR Human Chains, Protests

LD0412122489 Moscow TASS in English 1159 GMT 4 Dec 89

[Text] Berlin December 4 TASS—By TASS correspondent Vadim Chudov:

Shipbuilders, dockers and sailors in the north, workers, intellectuals and farmers in the centre of the country, and craftsmen and clergymen in the south stood hand-in-hand across the German Democratic Republic for fifteen minutes.

The human chain expressed the desire of East Germans for democratic change. Similar human chains appeared in the western and eastern regions of the country.

"Only honesty guarantees the future of our children," read a placard carried by a small boy, sitting on his father's shoulders. The father was part of the human chain at a crossroads in downtown Berlin.

It seems that this slogan really embodies the aspirations of the majority of demonstrators. Some insist that corrupt former leaders be called to account. Others call for a socialist market economy, viewing it as a way out of economic crisis. Eisenach residents hope for the improvement of the environment.

Guests from West German areas joined the human chains in the Suhl District in the southwest of the GDR. Citizens of both German states advocated an increased contribution by the GDR and West Germany to the consolidation of peace and disarmament.

Some participants called for the unification of Germany.

Nobody witnessing these huge displays of protest could fail to be moved by the motives of those present. The East German people are active again, after being ignored by their country's leadership for decades.

A slogan, "Many small people in many small settlements will change the face of our country," on a Potsdam bridge is a vivid sign of this.

The peaceful character of the demonstration, which is typical of East German renewal on the whole, prompts hope that the restructuring will lead the republic to real progress in the implementaton of socialist ideas.

'Crisis of State and Party Power' in GDR

LD0512090589 Moscow TASS in English 0759 GMT 5 Dec 89

["Morale Low Amid Turmoil in GDR"—TASS headline]

[Text] Berlin December 5 TASS—By TASS correspondent Vadim Chudov:

Public representatives worked into the night on Monday in Berlin's Humboldt University to prepare a joint "appeal to reason", as concern for the future replaced pride and exultation over sweeping reforms in the German Democratic Republic.

Representatives from the SED [Socialist Unity Party of Germany] Communist Party and other parliamentary and opposition parties, the clergy, and cultural figures spoke of a crisis of state and party power and plunging morals and public conscience.

Public uneasiness erupted into violence late on Monday as protesters stormed security headquarters in Leipzig and other cities.

The turmoil was spurred by rumours that corrupt officials were shredding archive documents which implicate them in wrongdoing.

The participants in the Humboldt University meeting warned that peaceful renewal in the country could crumble unless prompt action was taken.

A wave of public anger over abuses of power, corruption, crimes and cover-up attempts has swept the country, causing pain and despair, a document adopted at the meeting said.

This justified wrath, however, leads to actions which threaten citizens' security and life, the appeal said, calling on the government and the Volkskammer [People's Chamber] to provide a legal groundwork for public probes into corruption.

The appeal urged authorities to give control powers to citizens' committees to protect archives and documentary evidence which could help investigators.

"We don't have time for academic discussions," writer Roland Hirsch, one of the authors of the appeal, told TASS after the meeting.

"We must take urgent measures to prevent right-wing extremists from gaining an upper hand. We shall explain our position to the people as quickly as possible," he said.

Tensions Rising in CSSR Over New Cabinet

LD0512135589 Moscow TASS in English 1341 GMT 5 Dec 89

[Text] Prague December 5 TASS—By TASS correspondents Valeriy Rzhevskiy and Vitaliy Yaroshevskiy:

After several relatively calm days, tensions again rose in Czechoslovakia on Monday when Civic Forum announced a fresh series of meetings and rallies.

The main reason is discontent with the new make-up of the federal coalition government, which includes one representative from the Czechoslovak Socialist Party and from the Czechoslovak People's Party, as well as three non-party members. The opposition believes that the Cabinet does not reflect the whole structure of society and the democratic movements that have appeared recently.

Several hundred thousand people demonstrated on Wenceslas Square on Monday demanding the resignation of the government, the president and some Parliament deputies. They also pressed for creating independent trade unions on the basis of strike committees.

Mass rallies were held in other cities as well. It is expected that new changes in the government will be discussed during consultations and talks between Ladislav Adamec and representatives of the opposition. The latter threaten a new general strike if their demands are not met.

The urgent need for renewal and democratic changes have been reflected in programme documents elaborated by the main political forces. The first to make public their platform was Civic Forum. However, the newspaper MLADA FRONTA writes, the draft programme of the Czechoslovak Communist Party is more substantive and detailed. Time is needed before the party uses it as the basis for its work.

The first communique of the parliamentary commission, which probed the circumstances of events on November 17, are the focus of attention. It stresses that the events were caused by a growing schism between the policy of the former leadership of the Czechoslovak Communist Party and the situation and feelings in society. The results of the probe showed that law enforcement forces were illegally used to break up the student demonstration.

The topical problems of social development and ways of solving the crisis raise ever new issues, including the need to get rid of conservatism in thinking and actions, and to historically reassess mistakes and failures. The results of Moscow talks between leaders of the Soviet and Czechoslovak Communist Parties and their assessment of the dispatch of troops by five Warsaw Treaty countries to Czechoslovakia in 1968 as interference in its internal affairs, incompatible with relations between sovereign states, were received with satisfaction.

In an interview with Czechoslovak journalists after the completion of talks in Moscow, Czechoslovak Communist Party chief Karel Urbanek stressed that the heads of five Warsaw Treaty countries said, in a statement, that the dispatch of troops to Czechoslovakia in 1968 constituted interference in the internal affairs of sovereign Czechoslovakia.

History has confirmed the importance of using purely political means to deal with problems in the most complex international situations, Urbanek said.

Movie on 1968 Invasion of CSSR Premiered

PM0512140989 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 5 Dec 89 p 3

[D. Sabov report: "'Man on the Rostrum'"]

[Text] That is the title of a "Tsentrnauchfilm" Studio film premiered in the Cinema Center.

Director A. Ruderman (he also wrote the screenplay) and cameraman M. Aleksanyan finished shooting their new movie literally on the eve of the flood of political changes in the socialist countries.

The movie chronicles events in Czechoslovakia in 1968 with comments from the "main protagonists": K.T. Mazurov, former member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo who exercised "political leadership" of the operation to bring Warsaw Pact troops into the CSSR; and A. Dubcek, first secretary of the Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee, the leader of the "Prague Spring."

Hungary Reduces Armed Forces, Military Service

PM0412122789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Report under the rubric "TASS, AFP Report": "Hungarian Armed Forces Reform"]

[Text] M. Nemeth, chairman of the Hungarian Council of Ministers, announced while addressing a conference

of leaders of the Hungarian Defense Ministry and the Hungarian People's Army that the goverment has adopted a number of decisions which affect the organizational structure of the Hungarian Armed Forces, their tasks, and the country's defensive doctrine.

The Hungarian Government has decided, in addition to the 9-percent cuts in the numerical strength of the Armed Forces, to reduce them by a further 20-25 percent by the end of 1991. Beginning in 1991, the length of the military service is being reduced from 18 to 12 months.

Hungary's Grosz Discusses MSZMP Congress

LD0512021889 Moscow TASS in English 1517 GMT 4 Dec 89

[Text] Budapest December 4 TASS—Karoly Grosz, general secretary of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party [MSZMP], addressed a rally of veteran party members in Szombathely.

He noted that everybody is now responsible for preventing the degeneration of political struggle in the country. A constant shift to the right causes concern. If this tendency persists, this might lead to a tragic conflict, Grosz said.

The left forces should rally their ranks to prevent it.

Grosz said that the forthcoming congress of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party would be held in two stages.

At the first stages, on December 17, 1989, the delegates to the congress will discuss the political statement of the party and the principles of its functioning, and will also elect its leading bodies.

The second meeting of the congress is planned to be held in February. Grosz said that the Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party is holding its plenary meetings now. The meetings are convened in his own apartment.

Regarding the party's property, Grosz said that the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party has no property of its own, since the party relinquished its property rights in 1976-1977. That decision had been a grave mistake, he said.

Grosz said that the valuables owned by the party were handed over to the Hungarian National Bank in 1962. They were accepted by the then finance minister, Rezso Nyers.

Asked by a NEPSZABADSAG correspondent about the course of the organisation of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party, Grosz said that the party has been registered in accordance with law.

BCP's Overview of Public Contacts Noted

PM2911154189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Nov 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Sitting of the Bulgarian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo"]

[Text] Sofia, 28 Nov—The meetings that Bulgarian Communist Party [BCP] leaders have had with labor collectives all over the country vividly confirm the party's moral strength and political maturity, its readiness to honorably play a vanguard role in the process of socialism's renewal in Bulgaria. This was emphasized at a sitting of the BCP Central Committee Politburo held here.

It was noted that the meetings were held everywhere in a spirit of total frankness, with predominant support for the profound changes now being implemented. The participants emphasized that what the country needs now are not rallies and declarations but practical work to step up the perestroyka processes. Communists and working people asked the Central Committee representatives questions about the stabilization of the economy, the strengthening of discipline, the improvement of internal market conditions, the overcoming of deformations in economic and sociopolitical life, and the strict observance of socialist legality and social justice. Anxiety was expressed in connection with some actions aimed at taking advantage of the new political situation for selfish purposes and detrimental to the renewal processes in the country's social life. There was indication of the need to further rally the socialist society, to strengthen the party, and to purge its ranks of compromised individuals.

Evaluating the meetings which have taken place, the BCP Central Committee Politburo noted that regular contacts between party organs' representatives and the public must be established as permanent practice and must be perceived as one of the fundamental demands of political activity in the new conditions.

The Politburo discussed proposals to amend and simplify some protocol rules and ceremonies involving the party and state leadership. It was decided that henceforth portraits of living leadership figures will not be displayed in party committees. The BCP parliamentary group was instructed to submit for discussion by the forthcoming session of the Bulgarian People's Republic National Assembly a proposal that leaders' portraits should not be displayed in state institutions and other public places. With a view to redirecting public funds, primarily into social needs, it was proposed to discontinue the existing practice of spending considerable sums on preparing for meetings with leaders of diplomatic missions in different cities around the country.

Deputy Premier Laverov at SFRY Envoy's Reception

LD0412155589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Nov 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Celebrating National Day"]

[Text] M. Veres, SFRY ambassador to the Soviet Union, organized a reception 29 November to mark his country's national day, Republic Day.

The reception was attended by N.P. Laverov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; B.I. Oleynik, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities; and other officials.

Yakovlev Says E. Europe Events Not Destabilizing

LD0312194989 Budapest Television Service in Hungarian 1800 GMT 3 Dec 89

[Excerpts] [Announcer] Mihaly Hardi reports on the Malta summit:

[Hardi] [passage omitted] It is the first time in the series of Soviet-U.S. summit meetings that the two presidents, Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush, have held a joint press conference. [passage omitted]

In the minutes preceding the press conference, I had an opportunity to ask Aleksandr Yakovlev, CPSU Central Committee secretary, the number two in the Soviet leadership, whether Moscow does not consider the East European changes, which are taking place with stormy rapidity, to be a sign of destabilization. On the contrary, came the reply; it is also in our interest that these changes take place in a calm atmosphere. That is why we consider it of key importance to exclude every kind of outside intervention, be it from the East or the West. [passage omitted]

West Europe

FRG Foreign Minister Genscher Begins Visit

Arrives, Met by Shevardnadze

LD0412181389 Moscow TASS in English 1755 GMT 4 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 4 TASS—West Germany's Deputy Federal Chancellor and Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher arrived in Moscow for an official visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government today.

He was met at the airport by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and other officials.

Visit Signifies Important Stage in Ties

LD0412123689 Moscow TASS in English 1204 GMT 4 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 4 TASS—By TASS diplomatic correspondent:

West German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher's visit to the Soviet Union, beginning today, will signify an important stage in relations between the two countries.

Good prerequisites have now been created for the development of Soviet-West German cooperation in the most diverse fields.

Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl's visit to the Soviet Union in October last year and President Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to the Federal Republic in June this year became events that opened up a new chapter in Soviet-West German relations.

During Gorbachev's visit to Bonn, a joint statement was signed. For the first time it recorded general politico-philosophical approaches with which the two world powers intend to guide themselves.

West Germany is now not only the Soviet Union's major trading partner among Western countries but also the country with which the Soviet Union has a package of cooperation agreements covering subjects ranging from the economic field to partnership contacts between cities.

The West German foreign minister will visit the Soviet Union in a complex period when rapid renewal processes are taking place in many European socialist countries, including the German Democratic Republic.

Berlin's course towards the establishment of an open society gives rise to contradictory reactions in Bonn.

On the one hand, West Germany welcomes changes in the neighbouring state and, on the other hand, certain circles are trying to bring up the German reunification issue.

Speaking at a news conference in Italy, Gorbachev emphasised that the fact of the existence of two sovereign U.N.-recognised German states had been brought about by history itself and therefore the reunification issue should likewise be resolved by history.

Artificially highlighting the issue would only complicate the current processes on the continent and this does not meet the interests of either the GDR and West Germany or Europe as a whole, Gorbachev said.

Despite the entire acuteness of the problem, the Soviet Union is prepared to discuss it in the spirit of new thinking, presupposing respect for the stand of the other side.

There is every ground to believe that Hans-Dietrich Genscher's upcoming visit to Moscow will serve to further develop mutual understanding between the two countries and the building of a "common European home".

Genscher Cited on EC Ties With East Europe

90UI0151A Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 25 Nov 89 p 3

[Text] Bonn, 24 November (TASS)—FRG Foreign Minister H.D. Genscher has advocated the continued expansion of the EEC's relations with the socialist countries.

The European Economic Community, he declared in an interview with Westdeutsche Rundfunk radio, could make an important contribution to the process of an improvement in East-West relations. An expansion of cooperation between the "Common Market" and the states of East Europe would have a positive impact on the development of their economy and would contribute to the success of the reforms.

The meeting at the end of last week in Paris of heads of state and government of the EEC countries, the minister recalled, discussed the position of the East European countries and also questions of economic assistance to Poland and Hungary. But he added, this by no means signifies that we are underestimating the reform processes underway in the other socialist countries, many of which are also displaying an interest in broadening relations with the EEC. The members of the community should, for their part, also give thought to what they could be doing to extend relations with the Soviet Union and the other East European states. After all, the transformation processes occurring there are closely interconnected.

Deputy Premier Silayev in FRG, Meets Leaders

Received by Weizsaecker

PM0412112589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 6

[TASS report: "Exchange of Opinions"]

[Text] In Bonn on 30 November, FRG President R. von Weizsaecker received I.S. Silayev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, who is on a visit. During their talk, the president noted the positive changes in Soviet-West German relations and indicated the need to further develop and deepen the all-European process. The maintenance of political stability on the continent and collaboration in the creation of joint security structures in Europe, he stressed, are an essential condition for the successful development of economic and humanitarian cooperation between all countries which took part in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

The Soviet representative informed the president of the state of economic cooperation between the USSR and the FRG and of the perestroyka process taking place in the Soviet Union. He expressed satisfaction at the course of the implementation of joint Soviet-West German projects.

On the same day, a meeting took place in Bonn between the cochairmen of the USSR and FRG commission for economic and scientific and technical cooperation, at which I.S. Silayev and H. Haussmann, FRG minister of economics, examined the progress in implementing the agreements and accords reached during the Soviet-West German summit meetings in October 1988 in Moscow and June 1989 in Bonn. It was noted that on the whole they are being fulfilled satisfactorily.

Expresses Condolences on Bombing

PM0412171389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Dec 89 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent Ye. Grigoryev dispatch under the general heading: "FRG: Tragedy in Bad Homburg"]

[Excerpts] Bonn, 1 Dec—As already reported, Alfred Herrhausen, head of the Deutsche Bank, died tragically yesterday, the victim of an act of terrorism. [passage omitted]

On behalf of the Soviet Government I.S. Silayev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, who is visiting here, expressed profound condolences to the president and government of the FRG on the death of A. Herrhausen.

Visit Summarized

PM0412161789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Dec 89 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent Ye. Grigoryev dispatch: "Cochairmen's Conclusions"]

[Text] Bonn, 3 Dec—A delegation headed by I.S. Silayev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, has ended its stay in the FRG. I.S. Silayev is a cochairman of the Soviet-FRG Economic and Scientific-Technical Cooperation Commission. He held a news conference with the other cochairman, H. Haussmann, FRG minister of economics, on the results of their meetings. Cooperation between our two countries has become more dynamic since the Soviet-FRG summit talks in Moscow and Bonn. This was pointed out by both cochairmen.

H. Haussmann cited the following figures: Commodity turnover between our countries has risen by 20 percent this year, while the number of joint enterprises has reached 150. More Soviet specialists and managers than "planned"—approximately 700 people—have visited here and familiarized themselves with West German industrial experience and with the organization of production affairs.

According to the Soviet cochairman, the current meeting aimed to evaluate the progress made in implementing the decisions and accords adopted in the sphere of practical cooperation between the two countries during their leaders' respective visits to Moscow and Bonn. Qualitatively new processes are now noticeable in our cooperation, one manifestation being the creation of joint enterprises Correspondingly, in the opinion of the Soviet side, direct contacts and direct cooperation between the two countries are now needed. In response to your correspondent's questions Minister Haussmann agreed with this concept, adding that the "commission cannot do without glasnost and perestroyka either."

I.S. Silayev had conversations with FRG President R. von Weizsaecker and Federal Chancellor H. Kohl. The

Soviet delegation visited a number of major firms and enterprises in various cities.

Slyunkov Confers With FRG Businessman

PM2911132789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Nov 89 Second Edition p 4

[Report on N.N. Slyunkov's meeting with the FRG "Hoelter-Gruppe" Association board chairman under the general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] A meeting was held 24 November between N.N. Slyunkov, member of the CPSU Central committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and H. Hoelter, chairman of the board of the Hoelter-Gruppe association.

Questions regarding the state and prospects of development of economic, scientific, and technical collaboration between the USSR and the FRG were touched on during the constructive conversation.

FRG's Rau on Outcome of Moscow Talks

PM2911131189 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 25 Nov 89 Second Edition p 5

[Interview with J. Rau, prime minister of North Rhine-Westphalia, by A. Zhukov under the general heading "On the Path of Fruitful Cooperation"; date, place of interview not given; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Before leaving Moscow for home J. Rau gave an interview to a SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA correspondent.

[Zhukov] Mr Prime Minister, what was the aim of your visit?

[Rau] Partnership ties were established long ago between our land and your republic. Although there are 10 times fewer inhabitants in the North Rhine-Westphalian land than in the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR]—there are only 17 million people—we have something to be proud of and to show in Moscow: the achievements of our industry, nature conservation equipment and so on. We are glad to admit that the main result of our present visit was the signing with our RSFSR partners of agreements on implementing a number of projects in the USSR to set up air and water treatment systems. As you probably know, we had a fruitful exchange of views on the most important European and world problems with the leaders of the RSFSR and the whole country.

[Zhukov] A large group of prominent FRG businessmen also came with you to the USSR. What are the results of their contacts?

[Rau] Indeed, more than 120 representatives of leading FRG industrial and financial companies came with me. Most of them agreed with their Soviet partners in principle to conclude contracts, particularly in the sphere of foodstuffs production. There are very interesting plans in the sphere of joint nature conservation measures. Incidentally, our visit made life easier for many West German businessmen. The changes in the traditional USSR economic management structures have confused many people: With whom can one trade and with whom not? During the talks with the Soviet side we helped to identify a range of Soviet organizations with which to trade.

[Zhukov] With the participation of SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA a Public Committee for Saving the Volga has been set up. Do you see potential for FRG firms to have contacts with it?

[Rau] As I have already said, North Rhine-Westphalian firms are well known for their achievements in the sphere of nature conservation equipment. We agreed with Soviet organizations that our firms will participate in implementing a project to clean up the Volga and create an ecologically clean zone in the river basin.

FRG Envoy Brings Genscher Letter for Shevardnadze

PM3011132989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] Consultations between A.P. Bondarenko, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Third European Department, and D. Kastrup, chief of the FRG Foreign Ministry's Second Political Department, were held at the USSR Foreign Ministry on 27 November. Certain questions pertaining to the development of bilateral relations between the USSR and the FRG were discussed during the consultations.

D. Kastrup was received by A.G. Kovalenko, USSR first deputy foreign minister. The FRG Foreign Ministry representative handed over a personal message from the FRG Federal Minister of Foreign Affairs H.-D. Genscher to E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister.

CPSU, SPD Academics Confer on Social Ideas

PM2111155189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Nov 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Scientists' Symposium"]

[Text] In accordance with the plan for cooperation between the CPSU Central Committee's Institute of Marxism-Leninism and the Friedrich Ebert Foundation, a symposium of Soviet and West German scientists was held in Moscow 14-15 November on the theme "Social Ideas in Program Documents of Communists and Social Democrats."

During the 2-day discussions, the symposium participants exchanged opinions on the theoretical activity of the CPSU and the Social Democratic Party of Germany and on the two parties' elaboration of program tenets.

The historic significance of the new political thinking and of the social processes evoked by perestroyka in the Soviet Union was stressed.

The symposium's work took place in an amicable and open atmosphere and was characterized by a mutual desire for the deepening of dialogue on theoretical questions of socialism and peace. The sides expressed satisfaction at the work that has been done and the intention of continuing it. The conviction was expressed that discussions of this kind, in which approaches and evaluations have both common and differing elements, are important for the deepening of the parties' scientific work.

Gorbachev Meets San Marino Communist Head 24 Nov

LD2411131389 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 24 Nov 89

[Text] Gilberto Ghiotti, general secretary of the San Marino Communist Party [CP], who was visiting the USSR Supreme Soviet session on 24 November, had a short friendly conversation with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev on the activity of the new Soviet parliament and on the original experience of the San Marino Communist Party, which participates in the two-party government of the Republic of San Marino.

Comparison of Gorbachev Milan News Conference

PM0312174789

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 3 December 1989 carries in its Second Edition on page 2 a report on CPSU General Secretary Mikhail S. Gorbachev's opening address to a news conference held jointly with Italian Prime Minister Andreotti in Milan on 1 December. The PRAVDA version, titled "Press Conference in Milan," has been compared with the Moscow Radio version published in the 4 December issue of the Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, pp 78-83, revealing the following differences:

Page 78, column two, from first sentence, PRAVDA reads: [Text] Milan, 2 Dec—As already reported, at the end of M.S. Gorbachev's visit to Italy the Soviet leader and G. Andreotti held a joint news conference.

M.S. Gorbachev's Opening Address

Good evening, esteemed ladies and gentlemen.

We have spent three days among the Italians. You have seen everything. You... (rephrasing)

paragraph three, fifth sentence, PRAVDA reads: ...temperament in people but probably there is more to it than that. Evidently, what I... (rephrasing)

last sentence, PRAVDA reads: ...important philosophical thesis. That's the first point.

Second: The substantial... (adding phrase)

Paragraph five, fourth sentence, PRAVDA reads: ...we live may stimulate some people to renounce all that has existed hitherto, even the positive. The negative... (rephrasing)

sixth sentence, PRAVDA reads: ...in which we don't always have time to ponder phenomena, not only at a political level but even in the press, too, when I know you have difficulty deciding what to write and what the crux of the matter is.

I shall cite a remark the pope made to me before our meeting. Referring to that remark, I told him in conversation that I share his idea that at a... (rephrasing)

page 79, column one, paragraph four, second sentence, PRAVDA reads: ...of our great joint activity in the... (adding word)

third sentence, PRAVDA reads: ...and the East. We have just had a meeting with business circles today. There are good prospects for progress, moving away from trade alone to new forms... (rephrasing)

paragraph five, first sentence, PRAVDA reads: ...lot about Europe with Italian politicians. Today, perhaps, the... (adding phrase)

second sentence, PRAVDA reads: ...are being sought to the question: In what direction... (adding phrase)

fifth sentence, PRAVDA reads: ...look. It has a unique culture, a tradition, political... (adding words)

sixth sentence, PRAVDA reads: ...Europeans to give the whole world something important in... (adding phrase)

column two, paragraph three, second sentence, PRAVDA reads: ...political process. This enriches us all.... (omitting phrase)

paragraph four, second sentence, PRAVDA reads: ...these are stimuli to development. This is the path on which we already stand. We are going... (rephrasing, omitting phrase)

paragraph five, fifth sentence, PRAVDA reads: ...can lay claim to being called serious only when it enriches itself with the experience common to all mankind, with what mankind has produced in relations between peoples, that is, with those same values... (rephrasing)

paragraph six, second sentence, PRAVDA reads: ...are doing. This understanding is really important.... (adding word)

last sentence, PRAVDA reads...in this sphere. [new paragraph]

I told His... (omitting words)

Comparison of Pope John Paul II Speech

PM0312151789

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian publishes in its 2 December 1989 Second Edition on page 1 Pope John Paul II's speech at the 1 December Vatican meeting with Soviet President M.S. Gorbachev. The PRAVDA version has been compared with the Rome television version published in the 1 December Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, pp 39-40, and found to differ as follows:

page 39, column one, paragraph one, last sentence, PRAVDA reads: ...great interest by the Catholics of the whole world... (adding words)

paragraph three, second sentence, PRAVDA reads: ...future of the Christian communities in the Soviet Union with increasing hope. Everyone knows the... (rephrasing)

fourth sentence, PRAVDA reads: ...many Catholic communities were dispersed and even now anxiously await the...(adding words)

paragraph four, first sentence, PRAVDA reads: ...guarantee for all citizens of the full... (rephrasing)

column two, paragraph one, last sentence, PRAVDA reads: ...I pray that they will be able as soon as possible to live according to the requirements of their faith. [new paragraph]

In a climate... (rephrasing)

paragraph two, first sentence, PRAVDA reads: ...the Orthodox Church, who are so close to us. In fact, we have a common patrimony with them and with them we want to work in the spirit of renewed ecumenical commitments to take Christ's Gospel to future generations and to work together in the enormous field of humanitarian activity in expectation of the restoration of that unity which... (supplying indistinct words, rephrasing)

paragraph three, penultimate sentence, PRAVDA reads: ...this is understood also through individual human experience and through the victories and defeats of nations. Therefore, the church as... (retranslating)

paragraph four, second sentence, PRAVDA reads: ...a universal solidarity, particularly with regard to the developing countries. Indeed, as I have already remarked, solidarity helps us to see the other—be it an individual, a people, or a nation—not as some sort of instrument but as a help, like yourself, upon whom it is incumbent to provide the opportunity to partake of the banquet of... (supplying indistinct words, rephrasing)

paragraph five, second sentence, PRAVDA reads: ...of any type and the intention to retain their own hegemony,... (rephrasing)

page 40, column one, paragraph two, first sentence, PRAVDA reads: ...its novelty and it cannot fail to attract attention as a meeting of exceptional importance, as a sign of the continuing ripening of a time rich with promise. The Holy... (rephrasing)

fourth sentence, PRAVDA reads: ...and people, to promote peace in Europe... (rephrasing)

sixth sentence, PRAVDA reads: ...to new agreements inspired by attention to the demands and expectations of the peoples. [new paragraph]

I express my... (rephrasing)

Shevardnadze Cited on Europe, Afghan Situation

PM0412162489 Rome LA REPUBBLICA in Italian 1 Dec 89 p 11

[Interview with Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze by Vladimiro Odinzov in Rome on 30 November; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Rome—The "common European home," which Gorbachev is very committed to building; regional conflicts, which Italy, too, could help to resolve; and, above all, the Afghan crisis, in which the unexpected meeting between Eduard Shevardnadze and Afghanistan's former king, Zahir Shah, could prove a turning point: These were the main topics broached by the Soviet foreign minister in an interview granted to LA REPUBBLICA during a break in his busy official schedule in Rome.

[Odinzov] Minister, what contribution have the Rome talks made to the establishment of the "common European home," especially with regard to its political and security aspects?

[Shevardnadze] Any answer to this question could seem like a simplification. The issue of the establishment of the new pan-European order and the quality of the new relations between East and West are based on the elimination of the final vestiges of the cold war. The idea of the "common European home" is both a global vision—in a way, the ideal model of a peaceful and secure Europe—and, at the same time, a program of specific and practical actions by the European governments that must be implemented right away.

We realize the difficulties that could be encountered on this road, but we are reassured by the fact that in recent years our partners have displayed more interest in and openness to this idea. I would like to believe that 1989 represents a turning point. During Gorbachev's recent meetings with Western leaders the outlines of the new Europe have become clearer thanks to the greater trust and mutual understanding on our continent.

From this viewpoint, the present visit to Italy constitutes a valuable continuation of the dialogue on this topic. It seems that it has been possible in our countries to take a step forward with regard to the most important aspect—defining the foundation and substance on which the new

pan-European order is to be based. This is how I interpret the significance of the Italian-Soviet political declaration, which truly reflects the progress in the political dialogue not only between Italy and the USSR but within Europe as a whole.

[Odinzov] The development of East-West relations is strongly influenced by the regional conflicts, and especially by the Afghan crisis: How do you intend to settle them?

[Shevardnadze] It seems to me that the regional conflicts problem comprises two main characteristics. On the one hand there are the manifold causes behind them and the specificity of their development in a concrete situation confined to a particular conflict. Obviously this is reflected in an extremely complex mosaic. At the same time, regional conflicts have many things in common—especially in the dangerous consequences that could bring, or have already brought, a country and its people to ruin.

The world today has already accumulated the experience for formulating a way to tackle some regional conflicts, but there can be no universal model. Nevertheless there are forms of conduct that must always be present when decisions are made, as is the case in international dialogue. I am referring above all to keeping one's word, the strict honoring of pledges made by the signatories of an accord.

[Odinzov] Are you referring to Afghanistan?

[Shevardnadze] Afghanistan is an obvious example of what I am saying. As you know, the diplomatic dialogue that continued until April ended with the signing of the Geneva accords, which led to the Soviet forces' withdrawal from Afghanistan. This eliminated the factor blamed for all the country's difficulties. Nevertheless, as the developments of the situation have shown, the road to peace is still long. Not least among the various causes, the most negative effect is exerted by nonobservance of the Geneva accords signed not only by Afghanistan and the Soviet Union but also by Pakistan and the United States. The large-scale interference in Afghan affairs by Pakistani terrorists is well known: In flagrant violation of the accords, large quantities of weapons are sent from Pakistan to forces trained in special bases and camps that should have been destroyed under the Geneva accords.

[Odinzov] It is already 9 months since the Soviet forces withdrew. How do you judge the present situation in Afghanistan?

[Shevardnadze] Despite all forecasts, the Afghan Government has not surrendered following the Soviet forces' withdrawal and is growing stronger and stronger. I am not referring to the military alone because, as you know, the opposition has not succeeded in reversing the situation in its favor by military methods. All its attacks have been repulsed by regular troops. The fact is that the Afghan Government feels more and more secure, and this has a direct impact on public morale.

Now all international aid and Afghan resources are being channeled into the peace plan that Najibullah presented at the recent nonaligned conference in Belgrade. On that occasion a mechanism was formulated that could contribute to peace. The failure to adopt the plan can only be explained by a lack of will on the part of the most rigid fringes of the opposition and those who finance and arm them. However, I would not want to draw any final conclusions. It is no secret that many of those who until very recently fought the Kabul government have now taken the path of a joint quest for decisions in the interests of the whole of Afghanistan.

Some are participating actively with central government in the management of responsibilities. They are not all supporters of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan: They include people with the most varied political beliefs, including monarchists and Islamic fundamentalists. In other words, the Afghan leadership is open to dialogue with all those concerned about the future of Afghanistan.

[Odinzov] What political and diplomatic solution does the USSR propose for resolving this crisis?

[Shevardnadze] It seems clear to me that it is necessary to begin with a conference of all competent and responsible Afghan forces. Such a forum could contribute to the creation of a leadership body to decree a cease-fire in the country. Then it would be necessary to establish a commission to draw up a new constitution and organize the holding of a general election to parliament. This election should take place under UN supervision, but other international representatives could also be present. The agenda should certainly also include the issue of an international conference on Afghanistan. Such a procedure is already being used extensively in international practice and there is no reason not to use it in Afghanistan's case, too.

[Odinzov] In view of the importance of the Afghan problem to the improvement of the international climate, is it likely to be among the topics broached in the Malta summit?

[Shevardnadze] We try to take every opportunity to discuss the Afghan problem, bearing in mind that its solution must involve all those committed to a development of peace. This is why we attach great importance to its examination with American representatives, who are guarantors of the Geneva accords. No high-level U.S.-USSR meeting has taken place without an examination of the Afghan problem, and we believe that this next U.S.-USSR summit will definitely prove useful.

[Odinzov] You met yesterday with Zahir Shah. What were the results of your conversation? Did you broach the Afghan crisis with Italian political representatives?

[Shevardnadze] Of course we took advantage of our visit to Rome to meet with former Afghan king, Muhammad Zahir Shah, who is very well known to and deeply respected by many Afghans. I cannot go into the details and the results, but I can say that the conversation was far-reaching and mutually beneficial.

We also devoted attention to the Afghan problem in the Italian-Soviet talks, in our contacts and consultations in Rome. With its great influence in the Mediterranean, we all hope that Italy can play its positive role in establishing the peace that the Afghan people—and not only they—need so badly.

Reportage on Yeltsin Visit to Greece

Gives News Conference in Athens

NC0112204089 Paris AFP in English 2015 GMT 1 Dec 89

[Text] Athens, Dec 1 (AFP)—Radical Soviet deputy Boris Yeltsin called Friday for a faster pace of reform in the Soviet Union, and also said that the reunification of West and East Germany was "not realistic in the near future".

"Any delay in perestroyka (Soviet restructuring) could be dangerous", Mr. Yeltsin told a press conference in the Greek capital.

He also called for abrogation of clause 6 in the Soviet constitution which proclaims the leading role of the party in Soviet society.

An outspoken advocate of radical reform in the Soviet Union, Mr. Yeltsin warned that it was necessary "to move rapidly towards radical changes in order to avoid discontent among the masses".

The Soviet deputy, who arrived here Tuesday and is due to leave Monday, said that the Communist Party bureaucracy was "a brake on perestroyka" and the "greatest conservative force in the Soviet Union".

A member of the party Central Committee, he was removed from the Politburo because of his attacks on its more conservative members.

On German reunification, Mr. Yeltsin said the proposal was "not realistic in the near future" since East and West Germany "have different standards of living and different models of society".

The withdrawal of all foreign armies stationed in European countries was a further pre-condition for reunification. "But slowly the obstacles will fall," Mr. Yeltsin added.

Meets Greek Leaders

LD0412233189 Moscow TASS in English 1858 GMT 4 Dec 89

[Text] Athens December 4 TASS—Supreme Soviet Deputy Boris Yeltsin and People's Deputy Viktor Yaroshenko stayed in Greece from 29 November to 4 December at the invitation of the influential newspaper KATHIMERINI, a radio station and a number of politicians, public figures and organisations.

The visiting Soviet parliamentarians met with Prime Minister K. Zolotas, president of parliament A. Tsaldaris, leaders of two leading political parties: New Democracy—K. Mitsotakis and Panhellenic Socialist Movement (PASOK)—A. Papandreou, as well as with secretary of the political committee of the left-wing and progressive forces coalition L. Kirkos, archibishop of Athens and all Greece seraphim, representatives of business communities, students and journalists. Yeltsin and Yaroshenko also had a meeting with the collective of Soviet missions and organisations in Greece.

The Supreme Soviet deputies discussed the situation in the USSR, progress of the policy of perestroyka and the difficulties our country faces on the road of revolutionary changes, especially in the economic field. They acquainted representatives of the political and public circles of Greece with the principal provisions of the programme of the Inter-Regional Deputy Group within the framework of the Supreme Soviet.

The deputies said their activity in the Supreme Soviet aimed above all at preventing a failure of the perestroyka policy in the USSR since this would be fraught with serious social disruptions.

"I have long followed with interest the processes at work in the USSR and I viewed them optimistically," Prime Minister K. Zolotas said. I sincerely wish success to the policy of perestroyka. The sides discussed Yeltsin's proposal that the Greek firms build 50,000 homes on a turn-key basis in the USSR.

In a conversation with the conservative New Democracy Party leader K. Mitsotakis the sides advocated the development of traditional friendly relations between the USSR and Greece, including in the economic field. K. Mitsotakis stressed that a more active dialogue with the Soviet Union is supported by the whole Greek people.

Organisers of the visit of the Soviet parliamentarians, including A. Alafuzos, head of the publishing enterprise of the newspaper KATHIMERINI, said that they would hand over to Boris Yeltsin, head of the delegation, one million disposable syringes for Soviet child clinics, the first batch numbering 100,000 to travel together with the people's deputies who will return home today.

The visit of Soviet parliamentarians was widely covered in Greek mass media.

General Staff's Omelichev on Swedish Lecture Tour

PM2911144989 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 26 Nov 89 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Stay in Stockholm"]

[Text] Stockholm, 24 Nov—The Soviet Union's approach to disarmament questions—that was the topic of a lecture delivered by Colonel General B.A. Omelichev, first deputy chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, at Sweden's Defense Staff. He drew his listeners' attention to the new Soviet initiatives strengthening peace and stability in the north of Europe put forward by M.S. Gorbachev in the course of his official visit to Finland.

During his stay in Stockholm the Soviet military chief also addressed Sweden's Foreign Policy Institute and the Defense Research Institute.

Baltic Capitals Get Direct Air Link to Sweden

PM3011150989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 1

[Own correspondent L. Levitskiy report: "Direct Flights to Stockholm"]

[Text] Estonia's first international air route, linking Stockholm, Tallinn, and Riga, has opened.

As always on such occasions, the passengers included a considerable number of journalists, politicians, and diplomats from the Soviet Union, Sweden, Norway, and Denmark. Formal speeches were made and souvenirs exchanged. But the main event was the brightly lit information board informing passengers of the departure of Flight 4737 from Tallinn to Stockholm. The SAS airline will make regular flights on Thursdays and Sundays, while Aeroflot will fly the route on Mondays and Fridays.

CPSU Greets British Communist Congress

PM2811172389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Nov 89 Second Edition p 1

[Message of greetings from CPSU Central Committee to the 41st Congress of the Communist Party of Great Britain]

[Text] To the 41st Congress of the Communist Party of Great Britain [CPGB]

Dear Comrades!

The CPSU Central Committee sends wishes for successful work to the delegates of the 41st CPGB Congress.

We express the hope that, in a period of profound changes in world development, the resolutions of the congress of British Communists and the programmatic document "Manifesto for New Times" submitted for its discussion will promote cooperation between the country's left-wing forces in the interests of British workers, peace, and progress.

Fraternal regards.

CPSU Central Committee

Congress Ends 28 Nov

PM3011165989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Nov 89 Second Edition p 4

[PRAVDA correspondent T. Kolesnichenko and TASS correspondent Yu. Sidorov dispatch: "Congress Ends"]

[Excerpts] London, 28 Nov—The 41st Communist Party of Great Britain [CPGB] Congress has ended in London. For 4 days delegates discussed the main problems facing the CPGB.

A heated debate developed around the "Manifesto for New Times," which contains a new concept of the Communist Party's strategy and tactics. Delegates instructed the Party's Executive Committee to produce a final version of the document, which was adopted as a basis, since speakers noted that the "Manifesto" contains vague and arguable formulations and contradictions.... The debates emphasized the "Manifesto's" important principle that there must be no lagging behind the problems posed by the times.

The congress delegates proclaimed the priority of universal human values in the contemporary world and noted the need to pool the energies of different political and economic systems in the struggle to save mankind from an ecological disaster.

In a special resolution adopted by the congress, Britain's Communists expressed support for the process of democratization and reforms in East Europe's socialist countries. It was emphasized at the congress that British Communists' main task in these conditions is to aim for the withdrawal of nuclear weapons from the territory of the country and all Europe, significant reduction of conventional arms, liquidation of military bases on foreign territories, and disbandment of military blocs in the continent.

In its analysis of the foreign policy situation, the congress emphasized the "great role played by democratic changes in the Soviet Union and the policy of new thinking." [passage omitted]

The 41st Congress delegates elected new leadership organs of the party. G. McLennan resigned as CPGB general secretary, having promised to continue to play an active part in the party's work. A new general secretary will be elected by the Executive Committee next January.

Girenko Pays Last Respects to Spain's Ibarruri

PM2411130189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Nov 89 Second Edition p 7

[Own correspondent V. Volkov and TASS correspondent R. Serebrennikov dispatch: "Farewell to La Pasionaria"]

[Excerpt] Madrid, 16 Nov—Working Spain today bade farewell to Dolores Ibarruri, the unbending fighter for the cause of socialism, democracy, and peace.

There is a constant flow of people into the Spanish Communist Party [PCE] Central Committee's Conference Hall, where the coffin containing La Pasionaria's body is on display. Tens of thousands of people bearing red carnations have come here to pay their last respects to this eminent figure in the Spanish and international communist and workers movement.

The honor guard around the coffin, which is draped in a red flag, is made up of representatives of numerous delegations from the communist and workers parties and national liberation movements, including A.N. Girenko, leader of the CPSU delegation and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. Spanish Communists learned with great gratitude of the CPSU Central Committee message to the PCE Central Committee, which notes that the CPSU will continue to do everything possible to develop further the friendship between the Soviet and Spanish peoples, to the shaping and strengthening of which Dolores Ibarruri made a historic contribution. [passage omitted]

Political & Social

Railroad Traffic Resumes in Azerbaijan

NC0512111289 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 0440 GMT 5 Dec 89

[From the republican press review]

[Text] After a week of strikes, normal work rhythm is being restored in our republic's industrial establishments, railroads, and construction sites. The newspapers report that the movement of freight cars on Azerbaijan's railroads has been restored. Trains left for Derbent, Kirovabad, and Nakhichevan on 4 December. Meanwhile, significant work has been carried out to secure the handover of railroad cars on all tracks. They are being handed over to industrial establishments in Baku and other cities so that equipment, construction materials, and assembled products can be loaded or unloaded.

The newspapers also publish an appeal by the locomotive brigades affiliated with the Kirovabad locomotive depot to the workers of the [name indistinct] and Imishly depots. The Kirovabad workers urge their [word indistinct] to organize and quicken the work that is being carried out. The appeal notes that a joint effort is needed to remove, in a short period of time, the setbacks resulting from the strikes.

Azeris Attack Armenian Militia Post

NC0512111789 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 4 Dec 89

[From the review of KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN]

[Text] Yerevan, 4 Dec (ARMENPRES)—The paper published the cable addressed to the editor of the KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN by the leadership of the Ghapanskiy rayon. The cable says: The Azeri residents of the Kubatlu rayon of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic opened fire with automatic weapons and rifles at the militia post and Karmarakar rest house in the Chaymaz region on the Kupatlu-Ghapanskiy rayons border at around 2000-2200 on 29 November 1989.

The population was justifiably indignant and angry.

NKAO Rally Supports Reunification Decision

NC0512105189 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1700 GMT 4 Dec 89

[Text] The rally held last Sunday by thousands of people in Stepanakert's Victory Square was the most graphic manifestation of the unanimous and warm support given by the people of Artsakh [Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast (NKAO)] to the joint decision of the republic's Supreme Soviet and NKAO National Council on the reunification of Armenia and NKAO.

Vachakan Grigoryan, chairman of the NKAO National Council and USSR people's deputy, addressed the rally. In the name of the participants in the rally he congratulated all the workers of the NKAO on the occasion of this historic event. He read the texts of the resolutions and called on the people to do their utmost for the implementation of the decisions of the Armenian parliament. He stressed that people must unite around the National Council as the sole functioning legal body in the oblast. He called for the consolidation of law and order, not to act on one's own initiative, and not to succumb to provocations.

Those who addressed the meeting pointed out that the Armenian people must decide their own destiny, and this it has done. Now concrete actions are needed. Unanimous decisions require unanimous acts. We must remember that the struggle is not yet over for the final institution of justice; this is because the USSR Supreme Soviet resolution on measures to normalize the situation in NKAO is categorically incompatible with the wishes of Artsakh and it has farther exacerbated inter-ethnic relations in the region.

The call of a group of army conscripts was read out at the rally. It was addressed to Colonel (Vinogradov), NKAO army commissar. The appeal requested that the conscripts serve their time on in the NKAO in view of the complex situation prevailing in the oblast.

A meeting of the presidium of the NKAO National Council was held that evening. It discussed the prevailing situation. Colonel Usenko, acting head of the administration of NKAO internal affairs, told an ARMENPRES correspondent about the incident in the Stepanakert airport: Unidentified persons used an explosive device at the runway of the city's airport at around 0300 hours on 3 December. A hole 1.5 meters wide and 28 centimeters deep was made. The operative investigation team from the NKAO internal affairs department and the operative workers from the main criminal investigation department of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry went to the site of the incident. There are no casualities. Flights were temporarily suspended during repairs, but resumed at 1600 on the same day. The incident is being investigated.

Resolution on Armenia-NKAO Unity Published

NC0412122989 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 3 Dec 89

[From the republican press review]

[Text] The papers have published the texts of the decisions passed at the 10th extraordinary session of the Armenian Supreme Soviet which ended two days ago.

The session passed the joint resolution of the Armenian Supreme Soviet and National Council of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomnous Oblast [NKAO] on the reunification of Armenian and NKAO. The decision states:

Proceeding from the universal principles of national self-determination and acceding to legal aspiration for

reunification of the two segments of the Armenian people torn apart by force, the Armenian Supreme Soviet recognizes the fact of NKAO's self-determination, and the congress of the plenipotentiary representatives of the NKAO and the National Council it has elected as the sole legal authority in force in the oblast. The Armenian Supreme Soviet and NKAO National Council declare the reunification of the Armenian republic and the NKAO. The Armenian republic citizenship rights extend over the population of the NKAO. The Supreme Soviet and the National Council hereby set up a joint commission to formulate practical steps to realize reunification. They assume the obligation to represent the national interests of the Armenian population in northern Artsakh [NKAO], Shaumyan rayon, and Getashen district.

The session also passed a resolution by the Armenian Supreme Soviet and NKAO National Council on the 28 USSR Supreme Soviet November 1989 decision on measures to normalize the situation in the NKAO. That decision envisages the effective return [word indistinct] of NKAO to the jurisdiction of Azerbaijan, contrary to the NKAO Armenian population's clearly expressed will which has been confirmed and documented many times in the decisions of its representative bodies.

That decision was made by circumventing democratic and parliamentary procedures. The USSR Supreme Soviet commission set up to elucidate the situation and to formulate pertinent proposals for the solution of the NKAO problem was not allowed to deliver a report to the session on its conclusions. The views of the people's deputies from NKAO and Armenia were totally and (?intentionally) ignored. The decision was endorsed hastily, without examination, and in the absence of the Armenian deputies who left the hall in protest. The endorsed decision is a retreat from the already limited measures, the implementation of which are presented as a necessary requirement for a legal political solution to the NKAO problem.

Instead of providing real state and legal guarantees for the security and normal national development of the Armenian population, they are asked to be satisfied with the promises of those who still intend forcibly to keep the oblast under their jusrisdiction. The Armenian people, who has lost millions of sons and daughters, will not allow its compatriots' lives to be endangered in the NKAO. The creation of future normal relations between the Armenian and Azerbaijanian peoples is possible only if this problem is solved on the basis of democratic self-determination.

The Armenian Supreme Soviet and the NKAO National Council decide, in accordance with the norms of international law and constitutional stipulations, to regard as a forcible annexation the enforced return of the NKAO—contrary to the will of overwhelming majority of its people—to the jurisdiction of Azerbaijan and keeping the [word indistinct] oblast within Azerbaijan, as is envisaged by the USSR Supreme Soviet decision.

Denying self-determination to a forcibly sundered segment of the Armenian people—the NKAO population—directly violates the underlying principle of the Soviet Constitution and undermines the Soviet Union's international obligations, including it obligations to the UN Charter and final act and concluding document of the Vienna conference on European security and cooperation. The aforesaid decision, being incompatible with the principle of self-determination and with the international obligations of the Soviet Union and its federal parts, is declared as null and void and having no legal binding on Armenia and NKAO.

The session also passed a joint decision concerning the statement issued by the USSR Foreign Affairs Ministry on the draft resolution of the U.S Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the NKAO. The population of Armenia and NKAO regard the draft resolution of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as a manifestation of the American people's concern and as a defense of the just demand of the NKAO people. The Armenian Supreme Soviet and the NKAO National Council express their regret that the Soviet Foreign Ministry considers that draft resolution as an (?instigatory) and interventionist act in the internal affairs of the country. They demanded that the Foreign Ministry (?not issue) any statement about the interests of the Armenian people or in its name without first obtaining the consent of the Foreign Ministry of the Armenian republic.

Comments on Supreme Soviet Decision on NKAO

Armenian Supreme Court Justice

NC0212121789 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 2130 GMT 1 Dec 89

[Text] The decision on normalizing the situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] has engendered a new and powerful wave of indignation in the heart of the Armenian people. Newspaper correspondent Ovnatan met Artavazd Gevorgyan, chairman of the Supreme Court of the Armenian Republic, to ask for his views on this decision. We are presenting them to you now under the title: Retreat From the Constitution.

Logic, he said, would have indicated that the problem put forward by the people of the NKAO would receive a just solution. Not only Armenians but even foreigners familiar with the problem were awaiting a judicious decision. There are two sides involved in the dispute. Is it possible to hand over the management of the future course of the oblast to one side when the other side opposes this and wants to be separated from it? In accordance with the second point of this decision, the oblast's soviet of people's deputies and its executive committee will be reinstated. However, both the soviet and its executive committee were operating until 12 January 1989, under subjection to the highest state authority of Azerbaijan, and yet the situation of the people of Artsakh [NKAO] reached a crisis point.

The creation of a union commission to oversee the measures to stabilize the situation in NKAO had been envisaged. Why did the Supreme Soviet itself not endorse pertinent legislation concerning the administrative status of the NKAO instead of instructing the side which keeps the oblast by force to do that? Years of experience were not taken into account and were not utilized in adopting this decision. Is it not clear that this is a step back?

The conclusions of the special deputies' commission set up on NKAO problem have been discarded and were not published in full during the USSR Supreme Soviet session.

The USSR Supreme Soviet has taken at face value the assurance of the chairman of the Presidium of the Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet that Azerbaijan's own administrative and government bodies will take resolute measures to lift the blockade of the railways and roads. Since when are promises to terminate lawless acts seen as a concession? The intended message is: You give up your lawful demands and we promise to end the lawlessness.

Let me also say that the solution of such a simple question should not have been complicated to this extent. Acoording to Article 87 of the Constitution, the NKAO is included in the structure of Azerbaijan; it is not an intrinsic part of Azerbaijan, it is simply inserted into its structure. If it is inserted, then it can also be taken out of the structure of the republic in question. This is allowed by law; the rest is a matter of legal technicality. For example, let us consider Article 22 in the new draft law on personal property. There, it is indicated in black and white that just like the republics, the autonomous oblasts shall manage their land and other natural resources in the name and by the will of the people. This means that they are the masters of their own destiny.

Simply put, the Supreme Soviet decision is not viable; it is unrealizable in practice. This is because it contradicts the just demand of the Artsakh people for self-determination.

While the legal practices during the stagnation years are rightly criticized, unfortunately even now, at this phase of restructuring, many decisions are made and then ignored. This no solution. A radical approach is needed.

Armenian Press Criticism

NC0212141389 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 1 Dec 89

[Text] Today's Armenian newpapers devote considerable coverage to reactions to the USSR Supreme Soviet decision on measures to normalize the situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO]. The decision is regarded as illegal.

Vladimir Tovmasyan, deputy chairman of the NKAO National Council, in an article entitled "Deceitfulness Again" writes: This decision not only has nothing to do with the solution of our just demand, but also tramples upon the dignity of the people of Artsakh [NKAO] and all Armenian people in general. One could conclude from all this that the deputies of the supreme authority are (?not perturbed by) the forceful processes going on in the country and the conflicts emerging in this or that region. [passage indistinct] The decision does not reflect the wishes of the Artsakh people; it will not be implemented and the situation will not stabilize in our ancient land.

Under the title "Again the Armenian Paper Ladle," essayist Berch Zeytuntsiyan points out that by voting in favor of this inhuman decision, the USSR Supreme Soviet has consciously taken upon itself the legacy and assumed complicity in the genocide of Sumgait. The sadistic games and cruel attacks of the union press and television against our little republic for the last 2 soul-destroying years and the [word indistinct] attempts to degrade the Armenian people in the eyes of the Soviet people should have prepared us long ago for such a decision. The real cynicism rests in the fact that after 2 years of upheavals, the Karabakh people are being returned to where they began, to slavery and colonialism. Certain [word indistinct] sentences do not alter the nature of this document. They are more a sorry showcase for words like attention, care, equality, and fraternity. Anyway, the Soviet showcase, as is know, exhibits things that do not exist in the country. This decision is also a deadly blow to restructuring, democracy, and openness. The pro-Azerbaijani Gorbachev—(?in the words of Sakharov)—made his first serious and fatal anti-Gorbachev move, writes Berch Zeytuntsiyan.

The correspondent of the YEREGOYAN YEREVAN newspaper interviewed Khrachik Simonyan, corresponding member of the Armenian Academy of Sciences. Asked to comment on the (?alleged) growth of anti-Russian sentiment in the republics, including Armenia, Rachik Simonyan replied: When today we express our will to live independently and and when we say that we must place our hope primarily in our own forces, we also want to remind those above that Armenia entered into the Russian state structure to prevent the Russian federal government from auctioning our territories in 1921 and that we did not enter the Soviet federation to accept decades of violation of our national interests; we entered the federation as an equal member [words indistinct]. If we are really an equal member of the federation, then how should we explain the shameful anti-Armenian propaganda that engulfed the whole country? How are we to interpret the fact that the central authorities protected our, quote, internationalist, end quote, neighbor from the very first hours of the NKAO movement? They did not even (?dare) to insult it for the Sumagit genocide and barbarous blockade. We see all this as a gross violation of the agreement signed during the creation of this federation. Today, the issue of Armenia's independence is an essential and unpostponable matter for us.

Azerbaijani Praise

NC0212111989 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1700 GMT 1 Dec 89

[Statement by Telman Aliyev, lecturer at the Azerbaijan Institute of Construction Engineering and candidate of technical sciences, on the USSR Supreme Soviet decision on the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, NKAO—recorded]

[Text] We have to read the decision several times to be sure that we do not miss anything. Our people have felt very uneasy for nearly 2 years. United on the same front, the Azerbaijanis—that is, the representatives of all peoples who live in the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR]—are well aware that the claims about a problem existing in the NKAO are a fabrication.

The establishment of the Special Administration Committee was regarded by our people as interference in the sovereignty of the Azerbaijan SSR. After they became convinced that the committee had failed to (?justify itself), our people demanded its dissolution.

First of all, I applaud the USSR Supreme Soviet for hearing the voice of the people of Azerbaijan and disbanding the committee. Secondly, and let me say this clearly, the decision fully establishes the Azerbaijan SSR's sovereignty over the NKAO, as has been pointed out by foreign radios.

What remains to be done now depends on us. It is good that we can debate a number of the decision's provisions, as pointed out by Comrade Vezirov in his speech at the meeting of the aktivs. However, I believe that a debate would be out of place at this time because the USSR Supreme Soviet has charged the people of Azerbaijan with normalizing the situation in the NKAO. Achieving this depends on our people's unity and [word indistinct]. I appeal to all our people, particularly to our youths, to use this great opportunity effectively to end the problem of the NKAO, which has been coveted but which is our own land; restore and safeguard Azerbaijan's sovereignty over the NKAO; and normalize the situation there.

Our sovereignty over the NKAO was disrupted long before the Special Administration Committee was established. Much of the responsibility for this belongs to us, because for a long time we forgot that the NKAO is part of Azerbaijan's territory, that it is an oblast of Azerbaijan. Nationalists and extremists could thus create a situation to further their own ends in the NKAO. They created this situation particularly in places where Azerbaijanis lived, hoping to force them to emigrate.

The USSR Supreme Soviet decision noted that Armenians, Azerbaijanis, and other peoples live in the NKAO. The Azerbaijan SSR government and not [word indistinct] will be responsible for normalizing the situation for all of them.

I wholeheartedly approve this decision and believe that we have a very important responsibility. All of us must do everything possible to resolve the fabricated NKAO problem once and for all.

Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet Commissions Meet

NC0312114089 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 0440 GMT 3 Dec 89

[From the Republican Press Review]

[Text] A report published in the papers under the heading "The Meeting of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet" today notes:

The first general meeting of the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet Plan and Budget Commission and other permanent commissions was convened on 1 December. The meeting was chaired by Deputy Ziyad Samed-zade, chairman of the Plan and Budget Commission. (?Faradzhov), deputy chairman of the Plan and Budget Commission, read a report on the state plan for the economic and social development of the Azerbaijan SSR in 1990 and on the progress of the 1989 plan.

The meeting also heard a report by Karayev, finance minister of the Azerbaijan SSR, on the republic's state budget for 1990. Karayev also presented an account of the budget's implementation in 1988. Nine preparatory committees were set up. A decision on the form to be taken by the debates on the plan and budget and the duration of the debates was adopted.

El'mira Kafarova, chairman of the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, addressed the deputies. Naim Fataliyev, deputy chairman of the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and a number of leading workers participated in the work of the commissions. The preparatory committees met on the same day to discuss their work schedules and other matters.

Azerbaijan Leaders Meet With Baku Workers

NC0312105189 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 0440 GMT 3 Dec 89

[From the republican press review]

[Text] The tasks outlined in the decision adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet on 28 November and the measures formulated by the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee to normalize the situation and restore confidence and cooperation were the focus of sincere meetings held by work collectives in Baku with members and candidate members of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee Bureau and leading officials of ministries and main administrations.

Abdul-Rakhman Vezirov, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, participated in a meeting held by the Baku [words indistinct] association. Ayaz Mutalibov, chairman of the Azerbaijan

Soviet Socialist Republic Council of Ministers Presidium, participated in a meeting held by the Baku [word indistinct] electrical equipment production association. Viktor Polyanichko, second secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, participated in a meeting held by the Paris Commune Caspian Sea dockyard production association.

The meetings noted that the USSR Supreme Soviet decision is an important document which guarantees Azerbaijan's sovereignty and which is aimed at halting interethnic discord, promoting the economic and social development of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO], and strengthening relations between the Azerbaijani and Armenian peoples.

Participants in the meetings approved the decision adopted by the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee on the tasks of the republic's party, state, and social organizations in light of the USSR Supreme Soviet decision on the measures needed to normalize the situation in the NKAO and stated that they are determined to change the situation and restore peace and security in every rayon.

Armenian Supreme Soviet Agenda Noted

NC0412135089 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1300 GMT 4 Dec 89

[Text] The 11th session of the 11th convocation of the Armenian Supreme Soviet opened today at Stepan Shaumyan Hall. Samson Tonoyan, chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet, opened the session. He presented the following (?agenda) for the session: first, the ratification of the draft laws on amendments and additions to the Armenian constitution and (?procedures) for the elections of Armenian people's deputies [words indistinct]; second, the debate on the state plan for the economic and social development of Armenia for 1990 and on the results of the 1989 state plan [words indistinct]; third, the state budget of Armenia for 1990 and the fulfillment of the requirements for the 1989 state budget; [passage indistinct].

Armenian Exclusion From Formulating Draft Hit

NC0112165489 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1900 GMT 30 Nov 89 89

[Text] The adjourned 10th session of the 11th convocation of the Armenian Supreme Soviet resumed its work in Yerevan today. Here is a report by Avtandil Grigoryan.

[Begin Grigoryan recording] This session of the supreme organ of state authority reconvened under extraordinary conditions. It followed the USSR Supreme Soviet [word indistinct] session, which on the last day of its 2-month long deliberations addressed the Artsakh [Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast (NKAO)] problem. The NKAO has been through every kind of experience during the last 2 years.

Without any examination and with utmost speed the country's deputies merely voted on the draft put before them (?that day)—a draft which did not emerge under the skies of the openness but was prepared behind heavy curtains that have been carefully preserved from the days of stagnation. No Armenian deputy had taken part in the formulation of that draft, including Grant Voskanyan, the Armenian member of the country's Supreme Soviet Presidium. Yet the document was presented to the session in the name of the Presidium.

The Armenian deputies of Artsakh also did not participate in the formulation of the draft and were informed at the last moment about the extremely dubious content unacceptable to the Armenian people. These deputies expressed their profound dissatisfaction and absolute disagreement and left this behind-the-doors game. History is repeating itself many times over. The most basic issues for the Armenian people are being dealt with without their participation.

The Armenian deputies, deeply wounded by this, enumerated their fundamental views and observations concerning the problem and then left the hall. The deputies, lacking a deeper understanding of the draft resolution presented to them orally and in haste on the last day mechanically voted to confirm it.

As a result, the (?NKAO) has been confined in the same cage. (This) decision is a collection of declarations expecting pertinent actions from Azerbaijan and therefore it lacks a methodology and prospect of implementation. Such a violation of the demands of the Artsakh Armenians was preceded by the full resumption of the blockade which was continuing under a different guise. Those few trains that entered Armenia and NKAO from Azerbaijan brought nonpriority freight or pillaged and smashed freight and construction materials.

This war-time act is (?reduced) to a mere strike on the part of the Azerbaijan railwaymen or ascribed to the barbarity of the so-called National Front, as though this huge country has not passed through the narrow straits of civil war at its inception, foreign intervention, and fascist attack and lacks the strength to eliminate the ignoble attempts to force Armenia to its knees. The limits of patience [words indistinct] have been reached and Armenian people can tolerate not longer the violations of its interests no matter what the consequences of its actions in defending its honor and right to survival.

It was under this spirit of popular will that the Armenian Supreme Soviet resumed its inconclusive session. After the debate on the agenda and procedures, it was decided to consider this session a joint session of the representatives of the Armenian Supreme Soviet and NKAO National Council.

The agenda included the USSR Supreme Soviet decision on measures to normalize the situation in the NKAO and the statement of the USSR Foreign Affairs Ministry concerning the draft resolution of the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee

Three or four issues remained on the Armenian Supreme Soviet agenda because the Armenian deputies had to leave for Moscow. These issues were (?the implementaion of the 17 September 1989 decision of the Armenian Supreme Soviet) about urgent measures concerning the tension in the region and the blockade of Armenia and NKAO; measures concerning the security of the Armenian population in regions bordering Armenia; progress in the implementation of the decisions of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee and Armenian Council of Ministers concerning the housing of the refugees and further measures to bolster the work in this direction.

After new proposals and debate, it was also decided to inlude the following issues in the agenda: the appeal of the NKAO National Council made to the Armenian Supreme Soviet; the 5 July 1921, decision of the party's Caucasian Bureau and 16 March 1921 Russo-Turkish treaty; the issue of revision of Armenia's obligations to the union; and the introduction of radical democratic reforms in Armenia.

Grant Voskanyan, chairman of the Presidium of the Armenian Supreme Soviet, addressed the session on the USSR Supreme Soviet decision concerning measures on the normalization of the situation in the NKAO. Later, he replied to the questions of the deputies and the representatives of the public organizations participating in the session. The USSR people's deputies; Vachakan Grigoryan, chairman of the Presidium of the NKAO National Council; and writer Zori Balayan rounded up the issue under debate. His Holiness Vardges, prelate of the NKAO diocese; USSR people's painter Grigor (?Khanjiyan); Jemma Ananyan, first secretary of the Idzhevanskiy party rayon committee, and others participated in the exchange of views.

The agenda was heavy with issues requiring deep examination and that would be difficult to process during the current session. It is possible that some of them will be debated in the next 11th session of the Supreme Soviet of the republic, scheduled for 4 December.

We will periodically inform you about the current session and its decisions. [end recording].

Draft Armenian National Movement Program

90US0238A Yerevan KOMSOMOLETS in Russian 4 Nov 89 p 2

[Text]

Ideological Principles

1. The Armenian people can best display their capabilities and possibilities, resolve national problems and contribute to the development of international politics by having restored their independent national statehood. With independent statehood and living without outside pressure under the conditions of the power of the people, the nation should independently determine the forms of its political, economic, social and cultural life. Only under these conditions is it possible to preserve the rights given to each individual at birth, the most important of which are the safety of life, freedom of the personality and the pursuit of happiness.

2. Most important guarantees of the actual power of the people are freedom of speech, the press and belief, a multiparty system, diversity of forms of ownership, the existence of free enterprise and the possibility of the activity of free trade unions. The supreme power of the state formation is the will of the people expressed by public referenda or the decisions of a representative parliament formed by free elections.

3. For millennia the guarantee of the existence and spiritual development of the Armenian people has been and remains the Armenian language. Without its native tongue the Armenian nation is doomed to disappear.

4. For centuries the determining role in the existence and moral and spiritual development of the Armenian people has belonged to the Christian faith. The experience of recent decades has confirmed that a loss of faith loosens the moral foundations of the nation and inevitably leads to moral degradation.

5. In implementing their national programs the Armenian people must rely on their own forces, not looking for anyone's patronage. Any opposite viewpoint is denied by historical experience and involuntarily contributes to the continued spiritual slavery of our people. The idea according to which the nation has everlasting friends and everlasting enemies, but not everlasting national interests, is a political delusion also.

We reject the policy, immoral and fruitless for our nation, which on the one hand presupposes as "diplomacy" inappropriate assurances of fidelity to one people and, on the other, requires the preaching of enmity in respect of other peoples or religions. At the present time national and state interests play a larger part in the peoples' relations than religious and etymological communities. The AOD [Armenian National Movement] is conducting a struggle for an ideology which is not congruous with national interests.

6. External factors undoubtedly play an important part in the history of a people, however, it is dangerous when a people looks outside for the cause of its successes and failures. This is demoralizing and leads to national self-annihilation. Unfavorable conditions and external pressure may force a people to retreat, but the nations which have faith in the future, preserve their moral and spiritual strength and display it at decisive moments will not only safeguard their national existence but also achieve the realization of their cherished aspirations.

7. A guarantee of the existence of the nation and its political successes is the spiritual and material might of the people and the cohesion of all national forces. International public opinion plays an important, but not decisive, part in the solution of Armenian national

problems. The steps of the Armenian people should be commensurate with the extent of our power, forces and possibilities, multiplication of which is a principle task of the Armenian National Movement. The Armenian nation has every opportunity for bringing the extent of its might into line with the essential requirements for the realization of national goals.

8. Our movement is not aimed against any people. Our principle is to live in peace and in cooperation with all neighboring peoples. But we are sure that peace and solidarity are possible only when they are based on justice and when the rights of each people are not infringed.

9. We are in sympathy with all the movements which are based on the principles of self-determination, the power of the people and social justice and we reject all manifestations of national discord and nationalism.

Immediate Aims

En route to the realization of the national aspirations of the Armenian people and proceeding from the political situation and the opportunities it affords, the Armenian National Movement sets itself in the immediate future the following tasks:

1. Reunification of Artsakh with Armenia.

2. The conclusion of a new interstate treaty between the USSR and the Armenian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] and the incorporation therein of the following points:

a) independence of choice of structure and activity of the state power and government authorities of Armenia;

b) recognition of the ArSSR's [Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic] full right to remain within or leave the USSR with an indication of the methods of application thereof in practice;

c) restoration of Armenian national army formations;

d) full independence of economic policy, including foreign trade;

e) the right to establish diplomatic relations with other countries;

f) right to membership of international organizations;

g) the USSR federal authorities must not interfere in the republic's internal affairs. Only the union laws and decisions which are ratified by the republic's highest legislative authority may operate on republic territory.

3. The creation of a constitution expressing the real interests of the Armenian people, which should be based on the experience of national mentality, thinking and history and also on international agreements on human rights and the final documents of Helsinki and Vienna.

4. Struggle for the achievement of real freedom of speech, the press, belief and mass meetings and demonstrations.

5. The switch to a new economic policy based on free enterprise. Achievement of a position where the land belongs to the peasant with the right of hereditary use.

6. The endeavor to ensure that Armenia achieve economic self-sufficiency in respect of the most essential products for living and also energy and construction materials.

7. Strict observance of the article of the ArSSR Constitution concerning the republic's official language. To the same end the elaboration and adoption of a system of laws on the obligatory use in the republic of Armenian and compulsory national education. To act in the direction of the restoration of the traditions of the national Armenian school.

To strive to ensure that all children of Armenian nationality in the ArSSR acquire preschool, school and VUZ [higher educational institution] education in Armenian, endeavoring to create this opportunity also for Armenians living outside of the republic.

8. To exert every effort for the restoration of the disaster zone. General leadership of the restoration operations in the disaster zone should be exercised by the republic Supreme Soviet. A most important task is preservation of the demographic nature and character of the national architecture of the disaster zone.

9. To ensure the free activity of the Armenian Church and to open new churches at the demand of believers. To restore Armenian national-religious holidays and customs.

10. To render Armenian refugees and repatriates from Azerbaijan and other parts of the USSR material and moral assistance.

11. To strive for the creation of new cities and municipal-type communities in the southern parts of the republic, which will not only ensure the socioeconomic development of these areas but also solve questions of accommodation of the refugees. To relocate a number of industrial enterprises and educational and cultural institutions to these cities from the disaster zone.

12. To initiate an implacable struggle for conservation of the nature of Armenia and the purity of the biosphere, recognizing that the severe ecological situation which has been created in the republic is not only threatening the health of the present generation but could also entail the mental and physical inferiority of coming generations. To consider a priority task the closure of harmful chemical works, primarily the "Nairit" Science-Production Association.

13. To seek on the part of the United Nations recognition of the fact of the 1915 genocide of Armenians.

14. To seek international recognition of the historical and legal right of the Armenian people concerning territory snatched from Armenia, recognizing that realization of this right is possible only as the result of a policy based on the ideological principles of the movement.

15. To struggle to ensure that the ArSSR Supreme Soviet recognize the illegality of the clauses of the Russo-Turkish Treaty of 16 March 1921 pertaining to Armenia and the decision of the Caucasus Bureau of 5 July of the same year.

16. To demand a rehearing in accordance with the principles of international agreements on human rights of the cases of all persons convicted on political grounds and recognized on other unsubstantiated charges as being "enemies of the people" since 1920. All illegally convicted Armenian figures should be rehabilitated with full restitution of the material and moral losses which they have incurred. All works of Armenian cultural figures and politicians and scholars of the past which were unjustifiably and unlawfully banned should be published.

17. To struggle for the full exposure and punishment of the organizers of and participants in the genocide of Armenians in Sumgait, the violence against and persecution of Armenians in Azerbaijan, the act of vandalism perpetrated by servicemen at "Zvartnots" Airport and the mass poisonings in Armenia.

18. To strive to ensure that the Armenians in custody pending trial and sentenced to imprisonment be held in Armenia.

19. Restoration of the historical names of localities of the ArSSR.

Armenian Economic Performance Evaluated

NC3011092289 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 0800 GMT 26 Nov 89

[Station commentary]

[Text] The press has published the Armenian State Committee for Statistics' statement concerning the republic's socioeconomic development during the first 9 months of 1989.

The statement says that development of the Armenian national economy during the current year is taking place under exceedingly difficult conditions. The situation particularly sharpened during the 3d quarter. The periodic closure of the railways and roads in neighboring Azerbaijan and the economic blockade of our republic since September created additional complex conditions for the national economy by greatly weakening natural development in all branches of the economy. As the statement indicates, the particular immorality of Azerbaijan's blockade of Armenia was manifestated in the prevention of restoration work in the disaster zone where work came to a virtual standstill.

Due to the blockade, a grave situation has arisen in Armenia's industries which provided R130 million worth less of production. The commissioning of sociocultural centers have been curtailed. Housing projects are not being completed.

Over the last 9 months, the growth of national income has slowed down in all branches of material production, with the exception of construction, trade, and municipal foodstuff services. The national income has fallen short by nearly R190 million, which comprises 4 percent of the total national income.

The blockade has also created a tense situation in the republic's financial system. As of 1 October, the amount of credit issued has fallen by 5.6 percent. The flow of money into circulation has increased 3.5 times compared with the same period last year.

The statement points out that in many food manufacturing enterprises, production of specific items has declined compared with the real output volume of 1988.

Less light industry goods, such as watches, furnuture, and knitwear, have been produced.

It is satisfying that the retail trade turnover plan has been fulfilled by 104.9 percent. The volume of state and cooperative trade retail circulation has increased by more than 16 percent compared with the same period last year. The sale of potatoes, vegetables, and (?citrus) fruits has increased by 31 percent, 30 percent, and 48 percent respectively.

However, the demand for televisions, radios, refrigerators, vacuum cleaners, washing and sewing machines, furniture, [words indistinct], and other goods is high and therefore these goods are in short supply.

During the 3d quarter of this year, the republic failed to receive more than R18 million worth of foodstuff goods. In turn, the fuel shortage has disrupted the adequate provision of subsistance, primarily foodstuffs, to the population.

The statement then mentions that due to the lack of fuel during the blockade, virtually no agricultural produce has been received in the national market from collective and state farms and from individual farmers. Large amounts of potatoes, vegetables, fruits, and grapes have not been transported from the fields to the retail markets. As a result, market prices for this produce have increased substantially.

According to the statistics committee statement, a total of 525,000 square meters of residential housing has been constructed by the infusion of state capital investments. Thus, the yearly plan has been accomplished by only 21 percent. Compared to the same period last year, 53,000 square meters more housing space has been put into use. However, an unsatisfactory situation has emerged in the earthquake zone regarding housing construction.

Only 22 percent of the yearly plan for school construction, 17 percent of preschool institution construction, 30 percent of hospital construction, and 13 percent of club and cultural center construction have been accomplished in Armenia.

There have been substantial deficiencies in the implementation of the instructions defined by the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers on 27 December 1988, concerning the recommissioning of socially important buildings in the earthquake regions of Armenia. The state statistics committee reports that 598 [number as heard] students are studying in day and evening public schools. One of every seven students is studying during the second and third shifts because of earthquake damage to school buildings.

Dear compatriots, up to 46,000 students are attending the intermediary specialized educational institutes of Armenia this year. The number of students at the institutes of higher education is 65,000. The institutes of higher education have accepted 9100 applicants for day shift education, 6.1 percent more than last year.

The statement indicates that the crime rate has increased (?perceptibly). Compared with the previous year, the crime rate in the republic has gone up by (?39) percent since the beginning of this year. This is cause for serious concern by everyone.

There are hopeful signs regarding the improvement of the environment. It is reported that compared with last year, the discharge of dangerous materials into the atmosphere has fallen by 26,000 tonnes, or by 20 percent. However, a massive concentration of atmospheric pollutants have been observed in the air of the cities of Yerevan, Alaverdi, and Ararat. There also have been cases of pollution of the Razdan River. All of these negatively affect the atmosphere.

As a result of scientific-technological advances, 90 new products have been introduced and taken root in the manufacturing sector. These include new electrical motors for accumulators of [word indistinct] disc cassettes, control panels for new types of compressors, diamond-coated cutters for nonmetallic materials, and metal working lathes with cross-tables. R272,000 has been invested over the last 9 months to retool functioning enterprises. Despite all of this, the total volume of manufactured goods has fallen by nearly 20 percent compared with the same period last year.

Because of the closure of the nuclear power plant, power output fell. The machine building enterprises have failed to receive raw materials and goods on time because of the blockade and thus have failed to fulfill the production quota for specific goods. The same could be said of [word indistinct] forestry and building sector which, for the same reason, have had interruptions.

Production of computer items, metal-working lathes, passenger cars, and nonmining building materials have exceeded the plan.

There was a production shortfall in automation capacity, [word indistinct] lines, sulphuric (?acid), wood working machines, and [word indistinct] and planks.

Shortly after the earthquake, 167 of the 185 damaged enterprises in the quake zone started operating again, either fully or partially. They fulfilled orders by 96 percent.

The state statistics committee reports that during the 3d quarter of this year, crop production, potato and vegetable output, as well as farm production have declined in Armenia in general and in the disaster zone in particular.

R365 million worth of capital investments, drawn from all financial resources, have been used to develop those branches which provide the agro-industrial sector with the means of production. This amount comprises 70 percent of the planned investment.

Due to the blockade of Armenia by Azerbaijan, the damaging effects of which are still felt, the realization of the 9-month development plan for the republics's national economy, in particular capital construction, has slowed down substantially.

This immoral act also affected exports to the outside world. The republic's enterprises fulfilled these orders by 86 percent.

We learn from the statistics committee statement that, since 1 October, joint enterprises have been registered in Armenia with the participation of firms and organizations from nine foreign countries. The establishment of joint ventures continues.

Crimes by Armenian 'Extremists' Claimed

NC2411234089 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1700 GMT 22 Nov 89

[Excerpt] Correspondent Eyvaz Yusupov reports from Lachin Rayon on the arrest of criminals:

[Passage indistinct] incidents in Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO]. In view of the fact that the motorway between Agdam and Shusha has been cut, the drivers of Kel'badzhar and many other rayons use the Lachin Rayon. The drive is impeded by firearms [as heard]. The road crosses through (Gayi) town, which has been recently built in Lachin Rayon. Prior to the opening of this 75 km road, the people used to travel for 300 or 400 km to reach Agdzhabedi, Yevlakh, Agdam, and other rayons.

Extremists from Armenia, joining forces with the extremists from the NKAO, have been trying to prevent the people from using this road which is suitable for the movement of all transportation vehicles. Although [passage indistinct] the forces of the extremists are being united. We have asked Tahir Khanlarov, deputy chief of operations of Lachin Rayon Internal Affairs Department, to brief us on the matter.

[Begin recording] More than 30 armed attacks were organized against our rayon by the residents of Goris Rayon during the past 3 months. Fifteen serious criminal offenses were committed as a result. Two of them resulted in loss of life and another two in serious damage. Regardless of all that has happened, the employees of our rayon's internal affairs department are strengthening the struggle against criminal activities. (Soveren Ohanesyan), who is from Goris Rayon, traveled from Yerevan to Goris to carry out an armed attack against Lachin Rayon. Meanwhile, (Basken Antonyan) and Artur (Agadzhanyan) were caught redhanded while committing a crime and criminal charges were brought against them. Criminal charges were also brought against [name indistinct] (Dallakyan), who lives in [name indistinct] town in Goris Rayon.

As I mentioned earlier, (Soveren Ohanesyan) was captured while trying to carry explosives from Goris Rayon to Stepanakert, the capital of the NKAO. (Basken Antonyan) and Artur (Agadzhanyan) were also captured while trying to carry explosive substances, firearms, (?fuel), and other (?materials) from Goris Rayon to Stepanakert. Furthermore, criminal charges were brought against (Dallakyan), who lives in [name indistinct] in Goris Rayon, for (?attacking) Makhdi Mamedov, a resident of Lachin Rayon's [name indistinct] town, and for attacking (Behlul) Mamedov of the same town while trying to (?steal) his cattle. However, the Goris Rayon Internal Affairs Department and the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic's Ministry of Internal Affairs have been trying to create every kind of obstacle in order to prevent (Dallakyan) from being arrested and punished in an appropriate way. [end recording] [passage omitted]

Baku Investigation of Armenians Completed

NC0112102989 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1700 GMT 28 Nov 89

[Text] The Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic's procuracy has completed the criminal investigation it carried out, together with the republic's committee for state security, of Kacharyan, Mikhailyan, Khazaryan, Mesetutsyan, Avramyan, and [name indistinct]. These persons are residents of Kafan in Armenia and have been detained in Zangelan Rayon in Azerbaijan.

The investigation established that the individuals concerned drove a Volga (?Gas-21) vehicle, which was registered as 86190 [word indistinct], into Zengelan Rayon's (?Chigiller) village, firing and flashing the vehicle's headlights, on the night of 1-2 August 1989. They had home-made explosives, handguns, and (?shotguns) in their possession.

Thanks to the measures taken by the employees of Zengelan Rayon's Internal Affairs Department and the residents of Mirami, Kacharyan and the others were arrested. Their effort to create an (?incident) was obstructed in time.

According to the material that has been compiled, Kacharyan, who has been tried several times for [word indistinct], hooliganism, and swindling, (?has been a wanted person) in the Soviet Union since December 1988. He is also an active member of the Nagorno-Karabakh Committee.

The file compiled on him and the others was passed to the republic's Supreme Court on 21 November 1989.

Fire Damages Georgian Oil Refinery; No Casualties

LD0412162989 Moscow TASS in English 1538 GMT 4 Dec 89

[Text] Batumi December 4 TASS—An oil refinery in Batumi, the capital of the autonomous republic of Adzharia, Soviet Georgia, has been damaged by fire started in one of the tanks containing 3,000 tonnes of oil at 2 p.m. on Sunday.

Although firemen arrived at the scene minutes after the blaze engulfed the reservoir, they failed to localise the fire which spread to another oil tank.

Efforts to put out the fire continued throughout the night. Today morning burning oil gushed from the second reservoir, setting a tourist centre, vendors' stands and service facilities on fire.

The refinery's treatment plants caught fire, too. The flames spread to the third reservoir and now threaten apartment houses. The tenants had been evacuated.

Fire-fighting is continuing. More engines are being added.

There have been no casualties. An investigation has been launched into the causes of the fire.

Commentary on Lithuanian Communist Party Plenum

LD0212050489 Vilnius in English to North America 2300 GMT 1 Dec 89

[Text] Here is a commentary on today's plenum of the Lithuanian Communist Party's Central Committee by Edvinas Butkus.

The plenum considered Mikhail Gorbachev's message to Lithuania's Communists and a discussion of the situation in the Lithuanian Communist Party at the Politburo sitting in Moscow more than 2 weeks ago. The general secretary's message was read by the visiting Politburo member, Central Committee Secretary for Ideology Vadim Medvedev.

In his long message, embracing a number of subjects, Mikhail Gorbachev formulates the principal problem of the Lithuanian Communist Party's independence as follows: restoration of an independent state outside the borders of the Soviet Union, establishment of an independent party by the Republic's communists outside the framework of the Soviet Union's Communist Party with this prospect in view, would bring to nought the real

progress achieved by Lithuania, its economy and culture, in the years of Soviet power. It would call in question the firmness of the foundations of the postwar European home, so painfully built up and not firm enough as yet. In another place Mikhail Gorbachev points out that any advance towards a split in the party would deal a severe blow to restructuring under such a significant turning point, too.

Wishing success to all the communists of Lithuania, Mikhail Gorbachev expressed the hope that the 20th Congress of the Lithunian Communist Party, to be held in the second half of this month, would become a significant contribution while elaborating the conception of the 28th Congress of the Soviet Union's Communist Party.

Central Committee Secretary Vadim Medvedev also read the yet unpublished Politburo resolution, the tone of which is much more forbidding than that of the message. The leadership of the Lithuanian Communist Party is accused of slipping into social democracy and direct criticism is voiced of First Party Secretary Algirdas Brazauskas.

Then the Lithuanian Party leader Algirdas Brazauskas took the floor. He dealt with the most burning issues, emphasizing outspokenly that the party's independence is the goal and means at the same time. He acknowledged the possible splitting of the party, but not on ethnic grounds. Argumentation was provided of the federalism principle in the party's structure.

During the news conference held right after the plenum, Edvinas Butkus asked Politburo member Vadim Medvedev about his opinion of Algirdas Brazauskas, who is accused of wavering in the resolution but was referred to as a flexible and experienced politician enjoying the support of the party and people by Vadim Medvedev. Answering the question, Vadim Medvedev said that criticism of Algirdas Brazauskas did not imply a negative assessment of his role in Lithuania.

The majority of the speakers at the plenum voiced outspoken criticism of the Politburo resolution. As for Mikhail Gorbachev's message, it was interpreted as a striving for dialogue, but the writer (Romas Pudaitis) said he was shocked not to find mention of the year 1940 there. In his closing speech Vadim Medvedev did not refer to the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact either, but he was asked about that at the news conference and he said he shared the view of Aleksandr Yakovlev, chairman of the parliamentary commission on the issue, outlined in the PRAVDA daily 2 months before. He said it was a difficult step but the Soviet Union was forced to make it, although he qualified the deal of 28th (?September) as an error, especially in the sphere of ideology.

At the end of the plenum, Vadim Medvedev made a long speech. He said that the Politburo had decided to accelerate and intensify the elaboration of documents for the 28th party congress and things he had heard in Vilnius would be considered while getting ready for the congress. According to him, the law on the economic self-dependence of the Baltic republics shows how far the party is resolved to go. He said that the gains resulting from the Lithuanian Communist Party's striving for independence were vague while the losses were, as he put it, obvious, referring apparently to a split in the party.

Medvedev Confers With Lithuanian Communists

LD0412114889 Vilnius in Lithuanian to North America 0100 GMT 1 Dec 89

[Excerpts] Today Vadim Medvedev, secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union Central Committee met first secretaries of the party city committees. The issues concerning party life, first of all problems related to the independence of the Lithuanian Communist Party, were discussed widely, in addition to other topics.

The guest from Moscow also met the delegates to the 20th Extraordinary Congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party—Communist Party members from Vilnius. Kestutis Zaleckas, first secretary of the party Vilnius City Committee, pointed out that although not much time was left until the congress there is still no unanimous opinion on the main statements of documents of the congress. [passage omitted] Other delegates to the congress voiced their position yesterday at the meeting of the communists—these delegates to the congress of the 20th congress of the Lithunanian Communist Party [were] from the Academy of Sciences of Lithuania, the Schools of Higher Education of Vilnius, and the Unions of Creative Workers.

The statement adopted at the meeting says that the plenum of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee will have an influence on the extroardinary congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party. It is evident that the point of view of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee is not unanimous either on the statute of the renewed party or its program.

Some members of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, says the statement, are determined to defend the status quo of the party and make attempts to cater to the conservative inclinations. Therefore the delegates of the party congress, bearing in mind the above conditions of the oncoming plenum declare that the restoration of independent Lithuania is incompatible with the nonindependent status of the Lithuanian Communist Party with the political program of Lithuanian Communist Party in which such objectives are not declared.

The statement says that members of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau must voice their opinion publicly concerning Article 6 of the Lithuanian Constitution which legalizes the autocracy of the Communist Party.

Therefore, defining the basis for the partnership between the future independent Lithuanian Communist Party

and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union should be discussed at tomorrow's plenum.

The delegates of the 20th Congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party demanded that the absolutely secret decision of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo which concerns the status of the Lithuanian Communist Party and which describes the political situation in Lithuania be made public.

Meets With Intelligentsia

LD0412132489 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1000 GMT 2 Dec 89

[Dora Petkauskaite report from the Palace of Artists in Vilnius]

[Excerpts] At about 0930, Vadim Medvedev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, and other members of the CPSU Central Committee, as well as the leaders of our republican Communist Party and administration, Algirdas Brazauskas, Vytautas Astrauskas, Vytautas Sakalauskas were met by the picket line of the Yedinstvo [Unity] interfront movement. The conversation with the picketers lasted for a couple of minutes. However, the main action began in the main White Hall of the Palace of Artists.

Algirdas Brazauskas and Vadim Medvedev made short introductory speeches. On several occasions Vadim Medvedev expressed his gratitude to the representatives of the creative intelligentsia for this meeting, stressing that without it, his visit to Lithuania would have lost one of its most important moments. The aim of the meeting, according to V. Medvedev, is to understand and to know each other better. The statement was later quoted by other speakers. It is very important that the conservative dogmatic forces do not become stirred up because the consequences would be unpredictable; however, one should not follow the path of blind and unrestrained radicalism, Medvedev said.

The debates, which needed no encouragement, began. The majority of speeches were full of criticism. Giedrius Kazimerenas of the Institute of Fine Arts, said that the most pressing issue today is neither the Lithuanian Communist Party Congress nor the status of the Lithuanian Communist Party; the most important question is the annexation of Lithuania. What can the guest say about the interpretation by the center of the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact?

Algis Gricius of the Academy of Sciences said that you say that it was the party that started perestroyka. Perestroyka was started not by the party but by Mikhail Gorbachev and his supporters. This visit here in Lithuania by you, Vadim Medvedev, should help to clarify to the Central Committee the real correlation of political forces in Lithuania and to understand what forces here support Algirdas Brazauskas.

Raimondas Kasauskas, a writer, said that discussion in the party started slowly. This spring nobody wanted to join the discussion. It was only the issue of the independent Lithuanian Communist Party that made the discussion lively. Is there anybody today who does not understand this? What took place yesterday [the plenum] was not a dialogue with the Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party, it was a dialogue with entire Lithuania. However, the center did not say anything new, and we also remained with our convictions.

Jokubas Minkevicius, an academician, asked who dared call the people the Soviet people? Genuine internationalism should rest on national awareness. It has become accustomed to label Lithuanian Communists as extremists and nationalists, but you yourself, Comrade Medvedev, said that many intelligentsia and educated people live in Lithuania. [passage omitted]

The healthy discussional tension in the hall was perhaps somewhat heated. However, I doubt if Vadim Medvedev will be able to answer all the questions. Anyway, we believe that V. Medvedev was given enough food for his current or future meditations.

Medvedev Visit Analyzed

LD0312173289 Vilnius in English to North America 2300 GMT 2 Dec 89

[Text] [Announcer] Coming up next is a commentary by Edvinas Butkus:

During his stay Vadim Medvedev did not shun meeting journalists and ended his last interview by wishing the Lithuanian Communist Party success in the election to the Supreme Soviet and local bodies of power.

In a similar vein he brought to an end his meeting with the Lithuanian intellectuals. There he was asked outright: Do the Moscow leaders accept such a version—the Lithuanian Communist Party remains within the main Soviet party but loses power during elections. The answer was equally outright: No, this version is unacceptable.

Thirteen speakers took the floor in a 3-hour meeting to share their thoughts about the past, the present and the future. Yet the results of this meeting and the visit in general are dubious, since, as the writer (Raimondas Gajauskas) put it, the center this time did not come up with anything new, whereas we insisted on our (?road).

Well first and foremost our (?road) means the Molotov-Ribbentrop deal. In this context the Politburo member Vadim Medvedev was told outspokenly we were living under occupationist regime and then asked why the Pact and its consequences had been for so long ignored in Moscow, thus complicating the situation.

According to Academician (Jacubus Menkavicius) the elimination of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact would open the way to real European home and would make a weighty contribution to mutual understanding the world over. We also want to be Europeans like all others, said the writer (Raimondas Gajauskas). He put a rhetoric

question: there are [word indistinct], there are sins, (?Why) we are as if nonexistent. What sins did we commit against God?

Incidentally, Finland was touched upon in the Academy of Sciences vice president, Algirdas Zukauskas' speech too. At present the Lithuanian-Soviet relations should be promoted the way the Soviet-Finnish cooperation developed in the postwar years. Having made the forecast that the inflation level of goods exported from Lithuania will reach this year roughly 25 percent, while the USSR average is about 10 percent, the scientist acked, is there any sense to stay in the federation if the center is unable to defend a tiny republic?

Looking to the future relations between the Lithuanian and Soviet Communist Parties, some speakers stated that Moscow should immediately concern itself with the future normal relations to everybody's benefit. An interesting and irrefutable counter argument against the stereotype of party unity was voiced by the sociologist, Professor (Arvydas Matulionis): What is it that unites the Georgian, Armenian and Azerbaijanian Communist Parties? The question naturally was left unanswered, just as no replies were given to questions about the disregard for the miners' strikes, the army, while some statements of the speakers were just rejected by Vadim Medvedev.

First of all, the statement made by the executive secretary of the Sajudis movement, Virgilijus Cepaitis, saying that the Soviet Union was a unitarian state and a direct continuation of the Russian Empire. Among other things Virgilijus Cepaitis called upon the Soviet leadership to enter into two way contacts with the Lithuanian reform movement Sajudis and the Estonian and Latvian Popular Fronts. Vadim Medvedev replied that contacts with public movements were not being evaded.

Some speakers elaborated the role of Yedinstvo in Lithuania by explaining that imprudent actions if its leaders had no adequate social basis in the Lithuanian society. Incidentally, Yedinstvo staged a scanty picket by the Artists' Palace where the meeting took place. (?Already deprived) of the Soviet citizenship, the leader of Yedinstvo, Valeriy Ivanov, told Vadim Medvedev. [sentence as heard]

So the visit is over and everybody turned to attend to daily matters. Current statements of Vadim Medvedev (?as if shaped the idea) of the pending cessation of the Lithuanian Communist Party could be mitigated by the party's successful participation in the elections, but it is hard to speak of any success in this rapidly changing situation.

Today the Lithuanian Communist Party issued an appeal to the electorate, party and public organizations and movements. The Lithuanian Communist Party has embarked on an independent road, determined jointly with other progressive forces to live up to the Lithuanian people's expectations to build an independent and democratic socialist state, reads the appeal.

Degtyarev Meets Lithuanian Opposition Parties

LD0412191189 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0800 GMT 4 Dec 89

[Text] During the visit by the CPSU delegation headed by Vadim Medvedev here in Lithuania, a meeting of Lithuanian political opposition parties and public organizations took place in Vilnius with Aleksandr Degtyarev, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Ideological Department.

During the 2-hour meeting opinions were given on pressing issues concerning Lithuania, the USSR, and world events. As concepts, such as annexation and occupation, totally unacceptable to the guest were included in the questions, numerous questions were left unanswered. When asked why there has been such a long delay in publication of conclusions on the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact, the high-ranking official said this is a problem of worldwide importance and, therefore, research into it requires time. Degtyarev said he belongs to the CPSU of today and therefore can not be responsible for mistakes and crimes committed by the party in the past.

When discussion on political pluralism in Lithuania began, the guest said the Sajudis is already a party judging by its structure and he saw in that regional political pluralism. Lithuania was compared to Bavaria in West Germany where specific characteristics of the area exist.

Estonian Draft Budget Described

LD0512110589 Moscow TASS in English 1034 GMT 5 Dec 89

["Estonia: What Does the New Budget Mean for the Economy?"—TASS headline]

[Text] Tallinn December 1—By ETA correspondent Alexander Suits:

The 1990 draft budget of the Soviet Baltic republic of Estonia is the only bill that did not provoke objections from Estonian government members.

The ministers' unusual unanimity came about because the draft budget fully accords with Estonia's republican cost-accounting principles, Estonian Prime Minister Indrek Toome said.

It is difficult to change over to cost-accounting principles if the budget, a little over 1,700 million roubles, has a deficit of about 100 million. It is necessary to bridge the gap without imposing new taxes and without freezing wages. The new budget making principle is expected to solve this problem and incur the lowest possible losses.

The new principle is based on the independence of three budget levels: union, republican and local. The republic itself settles accounts with the union (by decision of the

USSR Supreme Soviet Estonia's union tax will be 341 million roubles next year), but it is not responsible for local budgets.

The republic sets firm rates of deductions from its revenues and grants the right, within the laws, to levy local taxes, above all on enterprises located on the republican territory. The development of the social sphere and the infrastructure in the area, is almost entirely funded by local government bodies.

The main expenses for production are not funded from the budget for the first time. The biggest department, the State Committee for the Industry, will receive only about 8 million roubles from the republican budget next year. Over 7.5 millions will be used to make up for the difference between wholesale and retail prices of commodities, when wholesale prices are higher—for instance, in children's goods.

Nobody will finance enterprises: They will rely on cost-accounting. Unprofitable enterprises will encounter difficulties. But in order to turn a profit, they will be stimulated to produce commodities that people need.

Enterprises, both state and cooperative, are becoming the main force behind the republican budget. "It is good for the enterprises, we are rid of departmental "surveillance' and can freely dispose of our production," Jullas Taht, Estoplast factory chief enginer, believes. His opinion is shared by most of Estonian enterprise managers.

Other residents in the republic, including pensioners, students and invalids, also benefit from the budget. Owing to the new budget forming principle, the lion's share of its expenses is designed for the social sphere.

Estonian Secretary on Medvedev, Yakovlev Talks

LD0412112789 Tallin Domestic Service in Estonian 1000 GMT 21 Nov 89

[Text] We begin with headlines from Moscow where Estonian issues are being pursued at the USSR Supreme Soviet and CPSU Central Committee. Over to (Jaan Raudsepp).

[Begin recording] [(Raudsepp)] Ideology secretary Mikk Titma, you met with Medvedev and Yakovlev in Moscow. What was the outcome and did you get any closer to your aims?

[Titma] Coming here was connected with specific problems in the republic, first of all of course the problems of the future, which concern the development of the republic as a whole; economic links; the problem, for example, of this nationality okrug [the oblast planned in northeast Estonia by a segment of the Russian population]. Those issues are not local issues. They have a much wider-reaching character. They are of a principled nature. It is clear that up to now in the Union it has not been very clearly acknowledged that there are two completely different social phenomena: one is when a tiny nationality group lives in a territory for centuries and this way acquires a certain right to this territory; and the situation is quite different when—like it is here where northeast Estonia is populated by non-Estonians, but with a generation, with just the second or third generation beginning to live there. There cannnot be a nationality okrug set up because these people lack the right to the given territory. And this can only be viewed as colonization, with quite specific questions arising in such a case. For example, Estonians were indeed settled out of Sillamae, out of Paldiski, cleared completely. And then, inhabitants were brought in. This has not even been a voluntary process, and even had it been a voluntary process, a right to this area does not come about quite so quickly. This must be a matter of centuries. Only then one can begin to pursue such a thing.

Well, those questions were first and foremost under discussion here.

[(Raudsepp)] And did they meet with understanding?

[Titma] Quite uniformly so at the top level. Should the question change so that it would bring with it an awful lot of ideological harm—and inevitably, I on our side presented the fact that we will come out with such argumentation; we simply will have to fight against such behavior—and one can say unambiguously here that the Politburo members understood very seriously what a precedent of this kind would mean because this is not the issue only with us. The same will occur in Latvia, also in Moldavia, and in a number of places where...even in Kazakhstan. The areas over there were indeed not empty. Indeed, it was there that Budennyy, in his time, simply destroyed the Kazakh population. So those questions are not that simple.

Another question which is under discussion now, in the way of perhaps a more specific subject, is related to the independence of our Communist Party of Estonia, beginning with out own budget, everything connected with Article 6, also the Communist Party of Estonia as a section of the CPSU. Is it then a federation of parties, republican parties? It is indeed clear that this argumentation that Communist Party of Estonia is a hand of the CPSU and is directly subordinated to Moscow; this argumentation is not simply a logical exercise in thinking. This argumentation has passed a lengthy history, with facts. And to simply imagine that at present it would be possible to say that in the future that will not be so, even if in fact at the moment we are pursuing indeed a totally independent policy; nobody can then proscribe from Moscow any longer. But this must also be formulated organizationally.

And the third problem of a more serious nature here is for us—we are here indeed as a full team, with (Valjo Koort), Toomas Leito [editor of RAHVA HAAL] and (Chernyshov) here—solving the problem of our press. Up until now the situation has been such that as in all countries, the press brings in certain profits. Up to now this profit has been taken into Moscow and afterwards

the larger section of this profit is returned to us for activity but this is precisely proscribed by Moscow. We are demanding that we should now indeed become free. [end recording]

Election Loss Predicted for Latvian Communists

LD0512104489 Moscow TASS in English 1022 GMT 5 Dec 89

["Latvia: Will Communists Retain the Majority?"—TASS headline]

[Text] Riga December 5—by LATINFORM correspondent Galina Grishina:

No party in the world, they say, will ever give up power of its own accord. But the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee seems to be ready to do just that—or so it appears to Yevgeniy Voloshin, a republican party workers.

Voloshin shared his apprehensions with readers of the local youth newspaper. His article is entitled "I cannot Keep Silent". In it, the author says, the Central Committee, deprived in the course of perestroyka of its power and pressure functions is now directing its entire thrust to secure its own survival. Under the conditions of public turmoil in the republic, giving rise to new movements, heightened national awareness and political activity of the masses, the Central Committee, according to its associate, has taken the 'neither peace, nor war' stance.

For some time, this stance yielded fruit. However, this stance cannot last. "It will result in a split on ethnic grounds or of ideas and principles and eventually members will begin to leave the party. A way out of the impasse is possible, if the bureau of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee resigns immediately,"—that is Voloshin's verdict.

The statement made in the course of the election camaign in the republic is viewed by some as a stab in the back. Others say it is an honest position of a Communist who sees no serious changes in the inner life of the party, the leading political force of the republic.

This fact illustrates once again that within the party, views of the most complex issues of Latvia's social and political life are no longer uniform.

Another illustration of this is a letter, circulated by news organisations here, by Riga's Mayor Alfred Rubiks, who is also a member of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee.

Rubiks claims that the Bureau of the Communist Party is to blame for the loss by the party of its influence on the masses and the relinquishing of control over the course of many events.

The internal instability of the apparat gives rise to reproaches both by the grassroots cells and the public movements—the International Front of the Working People of Latvia and the Popular Front of Latvia.

Incidentally, the latter organisation, whose more than 230,000 members are mainly Latvians, has benefitted from the present state of uncertainty in the Central Committee—it has already started a well-organized election campaign.

The front appears set to win a majority in local councils and the Latvian Supreme Soviet, outstripping by a sizable margin Communists who have no experience of genuine struggle for deputy seats: For decades seats in local councils were guaranteed to party leaders.

What the competition will eventually lead to will shortly become clear. The elections to the local councils are scheduled for December, and the republican parliament—for March next year.

But one thing is already clear—the competition will be stiff. The Popular Front will certainly figure as the main opponent of the Communist Party. At its second congress in autumn, the Popular Front indeed showed it was a new political force.

A congress of the Social Democratic Party will adopt the new party's rules and programme in early December.

Power is again point one on the agenda—characteristic of any revolution, and this is the very word often used to describe perestroyka in the Soviet Union.

'Heat' of Campaign 'Intensifiying'

PM0412125489 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Dec 89 First Edition p 3

[Correspondent O. Meshkov report under the rubric "Toward the Elections": "The Candidates Compete"]

[Text] Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR]—The attention of Latvia's inhabitants has recently been focused on the USSR Supreme Soviet session's discussion of the law on granting economic autonomy to the Baltic republics. It cannot be denied that the debates were exceptionally heated. But the law was adopted, and now people's thoughts are turned to how things will go for them and whether it will be possible adequately to make use, for everyone's benefit, of the autonomy granted. And the answer to this question depends largely on who will work on the new city and rayon soviets.

The heat of the election campaign is intensifying. Many social and informal organizations are taking part. The Riga City Party Committee [gorkom] has put forward its election platform.

A party gorkom plenum was held recently, in the course of which we formulated our position for the elections, A. Klautsen, first secretary of the gorkom, said. Our efforts are aimed at forming a body of deputies on the rayon and city soviets that will embody in practice the Leninist slogan 'All power to the soviets!' In particular, we support the idea of real self-management for the soviets,

the program that was formulated and is already being implemented by Riga City Soviet Executive Committee. In our election platform we place in the forefront the resolution of tasks directly connected with people's everyday lives. Thus the pace of housing construction has declined recently. And therefore we say that we will make every effort to ensure that the slogan put forward by the party in connection with providing Soviet people with housing becomes a reality. We will develop health care, consumer services, and the trade network, and many questions have to be resolved in the sphere of public education.

In the election contest we have to reckon with the energetic operations of other social organizations. Well, that is the normal state of affairs in a democratic society. We should base our relations with the Latvian People's Front on the greatest possible contacts, the quest for compromise solutions, and support for those candidate deputies who are capable of tackling socioeconomic problems. Ultimately it is not so very significant whom a contender represents, what is much more important is his political and practical qualities. True, our slogans and our position have not met with the support of the People's Front Duma. Furthermore, a struggle against Communist Party representatives in the elections has been declared. We are therefore seeking contacts with ordinary members of the People's Front, so as to come together to support the worthiest candidate deputies. We call on all social organizations to form a united front with us and seek the election to the soviets of those contenders who support our platform."

Unfortunately, in the course of the election campaign violations of the principles of democracy are occurring. Thus one small social organization decided to field its own candidate deputies in several okrugs. The city electoral commission refused them registration. The social organization went to court. The people's court in the republican capital's Oktyabrskiy Rayon examined the case and instructed the electoral commission to register the candidates. As you can see, the conflict was resolved promptly on a legal basis.

It must be noted that the election meetings held in the republic were, as a rule, heated, and people spent a long time discussing the merits and shortcomings of the candidates' programs. In some okrugs there were a good many of them in the end. In Riga, for instance, the "champion," so to speak, is Electoral Okrug No 1 in Kirovskiy Rayon, where 20 candidates are contesting a single seat.

The diversity of ways of nominating candidates is also noteworthy. Thus in the city of Yekabpils candidate deputies were nominated for the the first time not in a shop or an office at an institution, but at a meeting of inhabitants of the housing district.

Army Daily on Latvian Supreme Soviet Session

PM2011103189 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 16 Nov 89 First Edition p 4

[Correspondent Lieutenant Colonel M. Ziyeminsh report: "Ultimatums Are Contraindicated. Our Correspondent's Remarks From Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet Session Which Ended in Riga"]

[Text] Riga—The 13th session of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet, 11th Convocation, continued its work 10-11 November, with 16 items on its agenda. The session summed up the results of the national discussion of a series of draft laws, and adopted a Law on Holidays proclaiming the following republican holidays: St John's Day on 24 June, the anniversary of the Latvian Republic's proclamation on 18 November, and Christmas Day (winter solstice day) on 25 December. A remembrance day—Lachplesis Day—was proclaimed on 11 November. The discussion of the question of military service by Latvian SSR citizens prompted broad debate at the session...

During the days preceding the session, certain circles in the republic tried to lend tragically sinister overtones to the discussion of the question of military service. Latvian church bells summoned the faithful of all religious denominations to a "great prayer service for the Baltic region's demilitarization." And they prayed: for the teenagers "who, at the dictate of their conscience, have refused to serve in the USSR Armed Forces," for those "who serve far away from the motherland," and for those "who have died in peacetime." In places where people usually congregate spontaneously leaflets were distributed containing the following appeal by the Club for Protection of the Environment in both the Lettish and Russian languages: "The Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet session is to decide the future of draftees from Latvia. Your activeness will determine whether the draft will be suspended and a law on alternative service adopted. Bear in mind that, as far the teenagers are concerned, the deputies' decision could be a matter of life or death." And the Club for Protection of the Environment proclaimed its demands to deputies in line with this text. Namely: "To immediately suspend draft orders, adopt a law on alternative service, ensure the protection of human rights in the Army, grant amnesty to teenagers from Latvia who have deserted because of unbearable service conditions, and dismiss criminal cases for refusal to serve in the Soviet Army."

The mass media, especially the publications of informal formations, acted in a similarly "pushy" vein. As for Yu. Vidinsh, leader of the so-called Party for the Rebirth of Latvia, he deemed it necessary to publish in YUNDA, that party's publication, the text of his own "statement" addressed to the Rezeknenskiy Rayon commissar (Vidinsh is a resident of Rezekne City—M.Z.), containing the following sentence: "I am returning herewith my credentials as a reserve Soviet Army officer and henceforth consider myself not bound by the military oath..."

Having been duly cranked up, the propaganda machine did its stuff, so to speak. Confirmation of this was provided by the clamor outside the republic's Supreme Soviet building on the first day of the session's work. The building was literally besieged by pickets. Young and old alike gathered there supposedly to express their innermost feelings—their personal attitude toward military service. But was it their personal attitude? I began having my doubts when I saw there, outside the Supreme Soviet building, a thin kid, an adolescent no more than 12-13 years old. He stood there, part of a chain formed by sturdy guys, holding a hand-written poster: "Empire of evil, we won't let you have our sons." There you have, I thought to myself, someone's unruly kid, and he is already starting to worry about the future of his own sons to come.

On the other hand, there were posters which were fully "appropriate" to the age, status, and general standard of development and culture of those who held them: "Stalinism, militarism, bullyism—the Soviet Union's incurable ills." Or this: "We demand suspension of the army draft pending adoption of a law on alternative service," "Esteemed deputies, suspend the fall draft."

The deputies must be given due credit: They did not succumb to the emotions and pressure of the extremist groupings, whose objective is to create and maintain an atmosphere of mistrust between the republic's indigenous residents and the Armed Forces.

Here is how Yanis Nesaule, republican Supreme Soviet deputy and chairman of the Public Commission for Military Service Affairs under the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, commented on his stance on this issue:

"Ours is the parliamentary way, and our actions must be governed by the laws alone. Regardless of whether we like them or not. Some radicals are doing a disservice to their sons and brothers by egging them on to return their draft cards and calling for a boycott of the army draft. They thereby only complicate the solution of military service problems. Refusal to be drafted and desertion are unlawful and there is no way we can support them..."

Yes, ultimatums are contrary to the very idea of creating a rule-of-law state, of which so much is being said and written today and for which we are striving. Creation of new legislation is not a matter of a single day or even a single month. This is what guided deputies when making their decision on the question of military service. We cannot suspend the fall draft, they said in reply to persistent demands by leaders of some informal organizations. There is no legal basis for this.

At the same time, it was decided to prepare a draft law on alternative service, the legal basis for this decision being the session's amendment to the Latvian SSR Constitution, whose essence is that citizens of the republic who cannot perform military service because of religious or other beliefs must perform labor service as laid down by Latvian SSR laws.

The session raised again the question of servicemen's voting rights. In this context, it is appropriate to say that Article 85 of the Latvian SSR Constitution laid down special procedures for servicemen's participation in elections. On the one hand, a section of the republic's population perceived this as a privilege for servicemen which is not extended to any social or national group of the republic's population or any social organization. On the other hand, residence qualifications were extended to candidate deputies from among the servicemen (5 years for local soviet candidate deputies, 10 years for the republic's Supreme Soviet candidate deputies). A section of the republic's population, and primarily the servicemen, of course, perceived this constitutional provision (quite correctly) as a restriction of their rights. The session introduced an amendment: Servicemen can participate in elections on a common basis, but they shall not be subject to residence qualifications, which remain in force, as previously adopted, for other candidate deputies.

The session analyzed opinions on the status of the republic's president—a proposal submitted by the Jurists' Association. The election of the president by universal direct elections would be seen as testimony in favor of democracy, Deputy Ya. Vagris, who delivered a report on this question, said. Such a step would help consolidate the republic's sovereignty and boost its international prestige. But at the same time, the speaker went on, the broad functions envisaged for the president would result in great personal power and could limit the Supreme Soviet's activity. There is no mechanism to prevent manifestations of authoritarianism, nor is there any certainty that this new development would improve the complex situation in the republic and lead to the consolidation of its residents. It was therefore decided not to rush into introducing the institution of president.

A sharp debate developed at the session around the report by I. Kezbers, secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, on the work of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet Commission for Evaluating the Political and Legal Consequences of the 1939-1940 Soviet-German Agreements for Latvia. By a majority of votes, the deputies backed the commission's conclusions, whose essence is this: "Latvia's entry in the USSR in 1940 is directly linked with the 1939 Soviet-German Treaty, and this treaty brought nearer the start of World War II."

...The bells in the belltowers of Riga's churches rang on the evening of 11 November while verbal battles were still being fought in the hall where the Supreme Soviet was sitting. The city was marking Lachplesis Day. For the Lettish people, Lachplesis is more than just the hero of the eponymous epic poem by A. Pumpurs and the play "Fire and Night" by Ya. Raynis, which presents Lachplesis as a daring and heroic folklore figure. Lachplesis is at the same time a symbol of the Lettish people's strength and impotence, a symbol of their destinies, a sign of the Letts' unaccomplished hopes and aspirations. But why

pick 11 November as remembrance day? This day coincides with two other events of historic importance for Letts. First, World War I ended then in 1918, and second, it was on 10-11 November 1919 that Bermont's forces were routed in decisive battles and Riga was liberated. That was a difficult day, the bloodiest day in the history of the Lettish people's liberation struggle against Bermont's gangs, a struggle that cost many lives. It was also on that day—11 November 1919—that the supreme military order, the Order of Lachplesis, was instituted.

Latvian People's Front Status After 2d Congress

90UN0170A Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 17 Oct 89 p 3

[A. Grigoryan article: "A Year Behind Us, What Lies Ahead. Thoughts after the Latvian People's Front Second Congress"]

[Text] The Second Latvian People's Front [LPF] Congress has taken place. It is now time to draw first conclusions. The chief of them is obvious: The stage at which the movement, which covers a broad spectrum of sociopolitical forces, was being established is now past. The new program, which is distinguished from the earlier one by its radical nature, outlines goals and ways to reach them.

The Concept of Statehood

One of the main goals of the LPF is to restore Latvia's independence.

Thinking about the concept of "independence," particularly in the context of the sociopolitical events of recent times, forces one to provide a straight answer to this question: in federation with the USSR or outside its framework? Nothing is written anywhere in the program (set there in black and white) that implies an actual and legal separation. But many delegates who spoke at the congress energetically and insistently emphasized that only secession from the USSR will insure total independence.

The reasons for this formal mismatch between the documents adopted by the congress and the sentiments reigning at it are obvious. They are first and foremost a reflection of the contradictions within the front itself. The radical wing (its basis is the DNNL [Latvian National Independence Movement]) has insisted, and still insists, on forcing through the process of citizen registration and the creation of citizens' committees. Moderate leaders who understand that even the shadow of a threat of discrimination with respect to a significant part of the population would strike a major blow against LPF prestige support another viewpoint. And so the choice was set on a parliamentary path.

Yes, attitudes toward the citizens' committees immediately before the congress caused very serious contradictions within the LPF. The threatening phrase "threat of a split" even appeared in ATMODA. In an interview given to ATMODA, LPF Chairman D. Ivans expressed it in his usual diplomatic way: "... today what worries me is not so much the excesses of radical views, but rather the shortage of moderate views." Ultimately there were enough moderate views. This can be seen from the marked preference given to D. Ivans (who again holds the post of LPF chairman) over the other contender, I. Kalnynsh, who holds radical views. But it is also obvious that the compromise does not indicate any loss of influence by the radicals, even less any change of course or change in the methods and goals of the movement.

So, as a result, where do the sides stand? Without rejecting the role of the citizens' committees as a "essential institution for protecting the interests of the Latvian nation," the LPF is setting course along a parliamentary path to achieve the independence of Latvia. This means active involvement in the upcoming elections and supporting their own candidates and creating a corps of deputies capable of defending the principles of the political sovereignty of Latvia and democracy and economic independence. It is proposed that already next year the LPF will act as a clearly expressed organization of popular power—to be followed by eliminating the monopoly of power by the CPSU and drawing up and passing a law on political parties in Latvia that will make provision for a free and guaranteed multiparty system.

The first thing that strikes one is that we have an alternative to the program of action of the Latvian Communist Party, which, defending the right of each nation to self-determination, "is striving to achieve Latvian sovereignty as part and parcel of the qualitative renewal of the federation of Soviet republics." With regard to the Latvian Communist Party itself, its role in the movement for a future democratic society is considered quite minor. What is this? Reluctance, or an inability to evaluate soberly the reality that has taken shape in recent times? Probably the former. In any event, the radical-minded leaders of the LPF believe that already today the situation is favorable for tossing the Latvian Communist Party aside. But is it wise to draw such hasty conclusions which will lead to the destabilization of society? During the years of perestroyka the Latvian Communist Party has shown that it is capable of uniting the interests of the different national and social groups in the population by translating them into a concrete policy.

Now, when we have both the Latvian Communist Party program for action and the LPF program, each inhabitant of Latvia is facing anew this acute question: which of them to support? This dilemma is especially acute for the members of the LPF who are in the Latvian Communist Party: with whom should they go further? Whom specifically should they support?

Today these questions face everyone, regardless of nationality or affiliation with a particular front. The search for answers to those questions must take place in calm and well-considered discussion, which is possible

only if democratic principles are observed and attention is paid to different views. But the LPF, while constantly declaring its own allegiance to the ideas of pluralism, does not always support it. The program that has been adopted, permeated with categorical demands, reinforces this opinion:

"The LPF demands that the highest organ of state power recognize Latvia's right to halt the action of USSR laws on the territory of Latvia."

"The LPF demands a halt to the action of organizations and parties that are organizationally subordinate to the USSR or other countries."

"The LPF demands that the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet recognize as unlawful the 14-15 July 1940 elections to the People's Seym of Latvia, and their results, and that the declarations on the formation of the Latvian SSR and its joining the USSR, which legitimized the annexation, have been without force since the moment they were adopted."

We are also forced to think about this with regard to the attitude of the LPF toward the principles of socialism as something that simply does not exist. The time has come, they say, to abandon the "socialism or capitalism" dilemma, which is not so urgent in developed countries. The argument for this approach is that it is more important for the people to advance in the material and spiritual spheres than to engage in fruitless debate about the basic attributes of particular sociopolitical systems.

The Market Model.

Economic development, as written into the LPF program, should be directed toward improving the well-being of the inhabitants of Latvia.

There is nothing new in this kind of premise; it is "a thing in itself." But it is worth talking about the methods used to achieve this. On what foundation does independent Latvia plan to build its economy? On the foundation of the free market as a counterweight to the discredited command-administrative methods. The center of this model is the attitude toward ownership. The LPF favors pluralism in forms of ownership: state, collective (joint-stock companies), and private. Only national ownership that alienates the worker from the means of production and the product made, which deprives the individual of the right to be master of the national wealth, is rejected.

There is a "kernel" is this formulation. The idea of changing attitudes toward ownership is now being actively debated in society; and in this debate the term "market" has become a key one. And from the standpoint of the LPF, there is only opportunity to make the worker an active participant and independent player in the process of production and distribution—to create a free market both for the objects of consumption and the means of production.

However, looking toward the future does not interfere with looking soberly at the difficulties that probably lie ahead. It cannot be said that this view has really been lacking in those who from the congress dais called for us to hurl ourselves into the elementals of free market relations. Yes, for the first time they noted that it will be difficult, but in return, unfettered private initiative, entrepreneurship, and competition will become powerful stimuli for economic growth.

Whence this almost totally unexamined confidence? Its sources, found first and foremost on the psychological plane, are understandable: it is a negative reaction to the cost centralization in production and distribution, which have exhausted people with the shortages. Hence also the readiness to adopt uncritically the experience of those developed countries that have achieved a high level of well-being for their citizens: let is switch to the market model, they say, and we shall prosper.

But now we remember that this was not achieved by the wave of a magic wand. A system of regulation for the economic mechanism, polished over time, operates there. The free market and competition that provides incentive for activity are just part of it. There is also planning (now being so zealously rejected by many of us) for strategic objectives in development, the flexible use of such things as taxes, credits, and subsidies by the state....

And we have the example of Poland. It is close to us because it provides an opportunity to see for ourselves the nature of the problems that arise during the transition from centralized management to a free economy. The chief of these are the sharp drop in the living standard for a considerable part of the population, the socially dangerous stratification of citizens into a rich minority and an impoverished majority. Not taking note of these variations means being a prisoner of illusions, and they are not simply harmful, they are dangerous.

When talking about the economic strategy of the LPF, we should not avoid this question: will this be accomplished within the framework of a unified all-union complex, or outside it? In certain speeches at the congress the call was sounded for achieving full economic independence as quickly as possible, right down to Latvia having its own currency and its own customs on its eastern border. Astonishing as it may be, these kinds of maximalist proposals, devoid of all serious justification, were actively supported in the hall. But in the program (and here we encounter once again the flexibility dictated by tactical ideas) the concept is more restrained. During the initial stage (before acquiring political independence) the LPF sets the task of achieving fulfillment of the recently passed republic law "On the Economic Independence of Latvia."

And the great importance of economic links with the USSR in the future is not denied. True, here various scenarios are considered for Moscow's reaction,

including a sharply negative reaction leading to a complete break in economic relations. The most sensitive matter in this case will be energy shortages. Here, Latvia is very dependent on supplies from outside, and it is 100-percent dependent for supplies of liquid fuel, natural gas, and coal. The consequences stemming from this hypothetical (but not out of the question) situation are virtually impossible to neutralize. Even optimistic experts in the LPF recognize this.

The LPF also sees another model. By acquiring independence Latvia may (like Finland) build special and mutually advantageous relations with the USSR. In this case the USSR will provide a broad commodity and raw materials market, while Latvia will serve as a convenient bridge for development of the USSR's links with the West. Here, economic relations with the other republics are not broken but modified. What does this mean? The answer is still very general: the conclusion of mutually profitable contracts for deliveries of raw materials and finished products, the creation of joint enterprises, and so forth.

Great hopes (it is still difficult to judge how justified) are being placed in economic relations with the Baltic republics. They imply a breakthrough to a qualitatively new level of integration. First and foremost in the sectors that are most developed in the region—machine building, transport, agriculture, and the sphere of utilization of fuel and energy resources.... In short, the idea is some kind of Common Market in miniature that in the long-term will become an integration process leading to the creation of an East European common market.

We see that here there are more questions than answers.

Shifting the Emphasis

Remember the First LPF Congress. The national question was the focus of attention there.

Its presentation and the very course of the debate, accompanied by a mighty burst of emotions, caused many SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA readers to ask bluntly: "Is it a people's front or a national front?" The new program emphasizes that the creation of a democratic society in Latvia and the restoration of its state independence is possible only given the active involvement of all national groups living in the republic, without exception. According to figures cited at the congress, the LPF is now supported not only by an overwhelming majority of Latvians but also by 64 percent of Russians and 57 percent of inhabitants of other nationalities (?).

One detail. The "National Question" section [of the program] is less radical than the others. It was not happenstance that at the congress both the speakers and those participating in the exchange of opinions in the corridors used the same phrase—"a moratorium on the national problem." While at the same time stressing that the emphasis has been shifted toward resolving tasks of a general democratic nature.

To a significant extent, this kind of approach is a reaction to the events of last fall. At that time, immediately after the First LPF Congress had completed its work, a wave of sharp (and perhaps in some ways painful) reaction to the squabbling that took place rocked the republic. Accusations of nationalism were hurled about (not always justified), and the opinion of the other side was not much considered. But it is also true that those advocating a sharp forcing through of the process of "demographic rehabilitation" of Latvians also remained deaf to the arguments of their opponents and often groundlessly accused them of chauvinism. The threat that society would be split along national lines was clearly seen.

Today the prerequisites have been created for eliminating the deformations that accumulated during the period of Stalin's reign and the period of stagnation. A law has been passed that establishes Latvian as the official language in the republic. The national symbolism has gained currency. At the all-union and republic levels realistic appraisals have been made of the events that left those tragic consequences for the Latvian people. Steps have been taken leading to restrictions on migration resulting mainly from arbitrary departmental rule and the reluctance of the center to consider the real demographic, social, and ecological situation in the republic.

But Latvia is a multinational republic and real policy must take this circumstance into account in order to prevent the recurrence of the danger that one of the main slogans of the struggle for independence may be "Latvia for the Latvians!" As was aptly noted at the congress, it is impossible to move toward a common goal with only half of the population. Well, so how to move together? The LPF is calling for unity on a common democratic platform. With regard to the principles of such unity, they are talking in very general terms.

This is far removed from the thought that the complexities that are rooted here are not known to the LPF leaders. But one way or another, they have remained in the shadows. The more so since they must take note of the congress. I speak primarily about the thought that has become ingrained in the consciousness of a considerable proportion of the Latvian population that it may find itself in the position of a temporary fellow-traveler. Appeals to accelerate the process of citizen registration are, naturally, growing stronger, but the suspicions remain. And, indeed, how can it be otherwise when, whether those who coined the expression like it or not, the very term "primary citizen" reminds people not so much of unity on common foundations but rather the possibility that the day is drawing nearer when they will start to divide people into the "pure" and the "impure." Who will assume this right? How far will he (or they) go? No matte what aspect one touches on, one burns one fingers.

Or take the demand contained in constitutional form in the program adopted by the LPF to establish the principle whereby decisions that place restrictions on the

vital interests of the indigenous nation can be submitted for consideration only given a consensus of all deputies. But if it is rather a question of "vital interests" then why is only the indigenous nation placed under the shield of the law? People may object to what I say by pointing out that the guarantee for the vital interests of the other national groups is the indigenous nation. Fine, but in this case, already today, it seems we must think about creating a mechanism for the realization of those guarantees.

The need for this did not arise just today. Those participating in the First Forum of the Latvian Peoples talked about it. And in response, I had to write about its work and say that solid cultural societies are obligated first and foremost to care for the weak. And this concern is not so much an obligation with respect to those who cannot help themselves, but rather a duty to oneself. To put it simply, the need is increasingly seen to devise a legal status for national minorities, think about the forms of juridical and material guarantees for their development, and investigate what real content can be imbued in cultural and national autonomy for minorities in Latvia... And a law on cultural and national autonomies is essential.

In conclusion, I would like to return to the interview that Daynis Ivans gave to SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA a year ago. In that interview he emphasized that there is no alternative to an alliance of progressive forces fighting for the renewal of society, nor can there be, and that the People's Front can and should be the basis for constructive dialogue between representatives of the various nationalities and groups in the population. Much has changed since then. The LPF has grown stronger and gained great influence. But the tension in society has also noticeably increased. We all sense quite well the crucial Rubicon at which we have arrived. Under these conditions it is the more important to continue a dialogue that opens the way to understanding and agreement.

Ryzhkov Report on 13th 5-year Plan Summarized

LD0412235589 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 4 Dec 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Just over a week remains until the second Congress of People's Deputies starts its work. Deputies and the country's government are getting ready for this great event.

[Begin Yu. D. Maslyukov recording, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member; identified by caption] Hello, dear comrades. It is no exaggeration to say that among all the important issues to be examined at the second Congress of People's Deputies, the examination of the government's report on measures for improving the economy, the stages of economic reform, and fundamental approaches to elaborating the 13th 5-year-plan will have a special place. In accordance with the congress' standing orders, this document, signed by Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, chairman of the government, was sent to the entire deputies' corps 2 weeks before the congress.

I would like to stress the two main problems which have priority in our point of view. In the period of 1990-92, the government believes it necessary to concentrate the largest possible amount of resources it has at its disposal for solving social issues. The first point is the development of consumer goods production and the balancing of the population's cash incomes and expenditure. The second point is preference or—I'd even say—special priority for the development of the social sphere, including housing, health care, national education, culture, and other issues.

As regards the 1993-95 phase, the government intends to allocate increasingly more resources to the production sphere, while paying the same attention to the social sphere. The production sphere should get a new impulse of development for creating conditions for expanded production in the 14th and the following 5-year periods. The plan envisages that social problems will be solved on the basis of coordinated work of all the national economic complexes of our national economy. And, at the same time, we do take into account that fundamentally new mutual relations between the center and union republics and between union republics and local soviets will take shape, and the real conditions for increasing the efficiency of the economy will be created. Certain clauses of the report are presented as alternative versions and stipulates that, in the process of further work between the government and the deputies' corps, both before and during the congress, these clauses will be completed.

Summing up what has been said, I want to say absolutely and definitely that the government sees all the complexity and the contradictory nature of the problems which have been building up in the country and developing in society. In many aspects, their exacerbation should be defused by the consolidation of society around solving the tasks raised in this document.

Thank you for your attention. [end recording] [video shows Maslyukov in a study]

Report on RSFSR Supreme Soviet Session

PM0412171189 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 29 Nov 89 Single Edition p 1

["Information Report on Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR) Supreme Soviet Sittings"—SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA headline under the rubric "12th RSFSR Supreme Soviet Session, 11th Convocation"]

[Text] On 28 November 1989 the 12th session of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet, 11th convocation, opened in Moscow in the Great Kremlin Palace at 1000.

Comrades V.I. Vorotnikov, L.N. Zaykov, V.A. Kryuchkov, V.A. Medvedev, N.I. Ryzhkov, N.N. Slyunkov, A.V. Vlasov, B.K. Pugo, O.D. Baklanov, A.N. Girenko, Yu.A. Manayenkov, Ye.S. Stroyev, and G.I. Usmanov took part in the morning sitting.

Deputy N.M. Gribachev, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, presided at the sitting.

Before starting to examine the session's agenda, the RSFSR Supreme Soviet formed a tellers commission for counting deputies' votes in the ballot.

The agenda and the procedure of the session's work proposed by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium were unanimously approved.

The following questions are included on the agenda of the session's work:

1. On the draft State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the RSFSR for 1990.

2. On the draft RSFSR State Budget for 1990 and on the implementation of the RSFSR State Budget for 1988.

3. On the ratification of RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Decrees.

After this the deputies went on to examine the questions on the session's agenda.

A.A. Khomyakov, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, chairman of the RSFSR State Planning Committee, and USSR people's deputy, gave the report on the first question on the session's agenda—on the draft State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the RSFSR for 1990.

Deputy A.A. Bobrovnikov, RSFSR minister of finances, gave the report on the second question on the session's agenda—on the draft RSFSR State Budget for 1990 and the implementation of the RSFSR State Budget for 1988.

After a break Deputy V.S. Chicherov, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, presided at the morning sitting.

Deputy I.M. Cherepanov, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Planning and Budget Commission, gave the coreport of the Planning and Budget and other RSFSR Supreme Soviet standing commissions on the drafts of the State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the RSFSR for 1990 and the RSFSR State Budget for 1990 and the implementation of the RSFSR State Budget for 1988.

The following deputies spoke in the debates on the first two questions on the session's agenda: A.I. Tubylov (Uvinskiy Electoral Okrug, Udmurt Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR]); Yu.N. Semenov (Leningrad Electoral Okrug, Kaliningrad Oblast); M.N. Laptev (Kandalakshskiy Electoral Okrug, Murmansk Oblast); S.S. Shalavina (Kamensk-Uralskiy Electoral Okrug, Sverdlovsk Oblast), and V.S. Uchaykin (Krasnoslobodskiy Electoral Okrug, Mordovian ASSR).

At 1600 the second RSFSR Supreme Soviet sitting took place in the Great Kremlin Palace.

Comrades V.I. Vorotnikov, N.N. Slyunkov, A.V. Vlasov, G.P. Razumovskiy, Yu.A. Manayenkov, Ye.S. Stroyev, and G.I. Usmanov took part in the evening sitting's work.

Deputy V.S. Chicherov, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, presided at the sitting.

The discussion continued of the reports and coreport on the first two questions on the session's agenda—on the draft State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the RSFSR for 1990, the RSFSR State Budget for 1990 and on the Implementation of the RSFSR State Budget for 1988. The following deputies spoke in the debates: I.Ye. Klochkov (Noginskiy Rural Electoral Okrug, Moscow Oblast); Sh.A. Mustayev (Tetyushskiy Electoral Okrug, Tatar ASSR); V.G. Syrovatko, chairman of the Bryansk Oblast Soviet Executive Committee; Yu.A. Marchenkov (Nizhegorodskiy Electoral Okrug, Tyumen Oblast); V.Ye. Seryakov (Chadanskiy Electoral Okrug, Tuva ASSR); V.M. Vinogradov (Leninskiy Electoral Okrug, Chechen-Ingush ASSR); A.G. Nazarchuk (Aleyskiy Electoral Okrug, Altay Kray); P.L. Goncharov (Novosibirskiy Rural Electoral Okrug, Novosibirsk Oblast).

The session continues its work.

Trade Union Plenum Discusses Strike Issue

LD0512025689 Moscow TASS in English 1804 GMT 4 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 4 TASS—At the forthcoming election to republican and local soviets, trade unions will act as an independent social force capable of expressing, implementing and defending social and professional interests of all the catgeories of the working people.

This decision has been made by the seventh plenum of the Central Council of Soviet Trade Unions held in Moscow today.

Gennadiy Yanayev, deputy chairman of the Central Council of Soviet Trade Unions, said in his report at the plenum that the trade unions will always be supporting fair demands of the working people.

On the initiative of the Central Council of Soviet Trade Unions and the government, the Supreme Soviet discussed and adopted a law on the procedure of the settlement of collective labour disputes. The law gives the right to working people to strike to protect their interests when all other means have been exhausted.

At the same time trade unions will never support strikes for political reasons and strikes called and conducted in violation of adopted law, Yanayev said.

The basic principle of the trade unions election platform is that economic transformations should not affect vital interests of the working people, Yanayev said.

Meanwhile, the use of new methods of economic management by enterprises and organisations, the conversion of military industries to civilian production, the conversion of building projects and other steps of economic reform lead to the growing redundancy of factory and office workers.

Yanayev said that the Soviet trade unions intend to press for the undelayed adoption of a state programme to combat unemployment.

A proposal to this effect has been sent by the Central Council of Soviet Trade Unions to the country's government, the speaker said.

"Our platform is a platform of openness and of the consolidation of sane forces in society", Stepan Shalayev, chairman of the Central Council of Soviet Trade Unions, told the plenum.

"It will show the Soviet people that trade unions, declaring for the socialist choice and socialism's renewal, will be doing their utmost so that perestroyka be implemented in the interests of people, and not at the expense of the infringement of their rights and the lowering if the living standards," he said.

"We launch the election campaign under the slogan: 'Land to peasants, plants to workers, power to the soviets', for there is no slogan that would be closer, and clearer to the working people."

The plenum adopted an address to members of the trade unions, to all people.

RSFSR Trade Union Council Tasks Detailed

904F0025A Moscow TRUD in Russian
15 Nov 89 p 2

[Article: "Concept of Activity of the Russian Republic Trade Union Council"]

[Text] The revolutionary changes taking place in all the spheres of our society's life, political and economic reforms carried out in the country, expansion of the rights and rise in the role of the union republics, development of self-management, and increase in people's public activity give rise to an objective need to unify the efforts of RSFSR trade union organizations in the protection of workers' legal rights and interests and to establish the Russian Republic Trade Union Council.

The Russian Republic Trade Union Council unites on a voluntary basis trade union organizations operating in the republic. It is formed on the basis of a direct delegation of representatives of sectorial and inter-union trade union bodies according to their equal representation, acts in accordance with the USSR Trade Union Charter, and constructs its work on principles of intra-Union democracy and glasnost.

The Russian Republic Trade Union Council sees the main task in representing and persistently and systematically protecting the legal rights and interests of workers and of all trade union members in bodies of state power of the Russian Federation.

The Russian Republic Trade Union Council unites and coordinates the activity of trade union organizations and their bodies, directs it toward the solution of inter-union problems, and organizes its work with due regard for the decisions adopted by the Russian Congress of Trade Unions, the USSR Congress of Trade Unions, and the AUCCTU. It is independent and not accountable in its activity to state and economic bodies, or to political and other public organizations.

The Russian Republic Trade Union Council has the right to legislative initiative and follows the fulfillment of laws affecting workers' interests.

It puts forward demands to state, economic, and other bodies to cancel and suspend actions and to make changes in decisions adopted by them, which contradict legislative acts.

The Russian Republic Trade Union Council:

—submits proposals to republic bodies of power on matters of improving social security systems with due regard for inflation, management of social insurance, protection of workers' labor and health, and state assistance to the family, as well as to the neediest categories—pensioners, young people, and the disabled;

—jointly with republic state management bodies, participates in the development and implementation of measures to ensure the population's full and efficient employment on the republic's territory, to improve the job placement system, and to ensure social guarantees for workers;

—studies the living standard of various groups and strata of the population, family budgets, and the "consumer basket"; participates in the preparation of proposals on regulating the correlation of the population's income and the index of rise in prices of consumer goods and services;

—with characteristic trade union methods and means, promotes an increase in production efficiency as the basis for the solution of social problems facing workers;

—if necessary, concludes agreements with the RSFSR Council of Ministers on the most urgent problems concerning the economic and social development of the Russian Federation;

—coordinates normative acts on the protection, conditions, and remuneration of labor within the competence of republic state, economic, and cooperative bodies;

—in accordance with existing legislation, examines and resolves differences between lower-ranking trade union bodies and corresponding state and economic management bodies in matters affecting workers' interests and the rights of trade union organizations;

—if necessary, supports the demands put forward by trade union organizations, raises the question of holding referendums, organizes rallies, demonstrations, and addresses in mass information media, and provides practical help in this to trade union committees and councils;

—interacts with republic unions, societies, organizations, and foundations in carrying out cultural and educational work among workers on developing and meeting their spiritual interests with due regard for national characteristics;

—participates in international education and improvement in interethnic relations and in the moral recovery of Soviet society, interacting with organizing movements and groups of workers;

—on the basis of intra-trade union democracy and wide glasnost, organizes the financial activity of trade union bodies concerning the trade union budget and the state social insurance budget and forms centralized funds;

—studies and develops new forms and methods of activity by trade unions under conditions of republic and regional cost accounting, self-management, and diverse forms of property for the purpose of protecting the rights of labor collectives; recommends the best experience in the work of trade union bodies for use;

—organizes the training of specific categories of trade union cadres and active members in coordination with the trade unions that form part of the trade union center;

—directs the activity of subordinate organizations engaged in workers' sanatorium and health resort treatment and rest and in tourist and excursion work and of the voluntary physical culture and sports trade union society;

—maintains international contacts with trade union organizations in the fraternal Union republics and, in accordance with the established procedure, with trade unions of foreign countries;

—has its own press organs.

Ukraine Primate's Statement on Legalizing Church

LD0412140889 Vatican City International Service in Ukrainian 0415 GMT 4 Dec 89

[Text] In connection with the meeting between Pope John-Paul II and Mikhail Gorbachev, which took place on Friday, 1 December Cardinal Lubachivskyy, primate of the Ukrainian Catholic Church [UCCh], issued the following statement:

Realizing the exceptional historical importance of the meeting between the holy father and the USSR president, I, Cardinal Myroslav Lubachivskyy, supreme archbishop of Lvov and the synod of Ukrainian Catholic hierarchy, all priests, monks and nuns, all believers of the UCCh in the Ukraine and abroad, join in prayer with his holiness in expectations of a better future.

The UCCh hopes that the guidelines set out by the holy father in his speech at the 6th UCCh synod on 5 October 1989 will be realized, namely: full religious freedom; open recognition on the part of civil powers; free access to praying houses; the right to organize the necessary hierarchical structure' and conditions for maintaining free contacts with their citizens both in the Ukraine and abroad.

Ukrainian Catholics in the homeland state, the cardinal continued, want to be responsible citizens of their country and take part in the process of glasnost and restructuring and of genuine democratization. The UCCh extends the hand of peace, Christian love, forgiveness and respect to the Patriarchy of the Russian Orthodox Church [ROCh]. It also confirems its readiness to establish a constructive dialogue for the salvation of souls and at the same it hopes the ROCh wil display the same amount of respect, love, and truce in a spirit of the Bible and justice.

Uniate Church Registration Not Legalization

LD0512023189 Kiev in English to North America 2200 GMT 2 Dec 89

[Text] Oblast papers that come out in West Ukraine have published the statement released by the republic's Council for Religious Affairs which concerns the registration of Greek-Catholic communities. Following the registration, they will be granted all the rights enjoyed by believers in the Soviet Union.

The communities can also approach local bodies of power with requests to hand over to them churches for conducting divine services.

However, our correspondent was told at the Council for Religious Affairs that the registration of Ukrainian Catholic parishes does not mean a legalization of the Greek-Catholic, known as Uniate, Church. This question can be solved in court.

PRAVDA Reports on Ukrainian Party Plenum

PM0412170789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
2 Dec 89 Second Edition p 2

[Report by correspondents M. Odinets and I. Tikhomirov: "Preparing for Elections. Notes from Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] Kiev—The Ukrainian Communist Party is persistently seeking paths of renewal. This was also reflected in the work of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee plenum which discussed the election platform of the republic Communist Party Central Committee for the elections of Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] people's deputies and local soviets.

"Never before have we had to hold elections in such a complex sociopolitical situation of confrontation," V.A. Ivashko, first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, said. "Our political opponents are uniting among themselves and employing overt lies, stooping even to provocations. The reactionary slogan 'Soviets Without Communists' has been dredged up from history. Modern social demagogues are misleading people, to put it mildly, with talk of debarring the party from its leading role in society."

Realizing the whole seriousness of the situation when preparing the draft document, the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee proceeded from the premise that it must reflect the opinion of the broad party public—from primary organizations to the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee. The Central Committee Secretariat, the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Party History Institute, and the Kiev Higher Party School worked on the draft platform. And in the course of the discussion in primary organizations and labor collectives the participants in the debate pointed out that it is clear from the election platform that the Ukrainian Communist Party will never deviate from the socialist choice and will deal a resolute rebuff to all who intend to undermine the foundations of our system and the friendship and unity of the Soviet peoples. The platform must be a very important factor in consolidating healthy forces around the tasks of perestroyka.

In former times the work on the draft would have been considered complete and it would only have remained for the plenum participants to raise their hands after a semblance of a formal discussion, denoting unanimous approval. This was not the case this time. Twenty-two speakers mounted the plenum rostrum, and each one spoke anxiously about ensuring that the text of the platform is precise, honest, and realizable and made his own specific suggestions and amendments to that end. It must be said that on the whole they were consonant with the thoughts contained in M.S. Gorbachev's article "The Socialist Idea and Revolutionary Perestroyka" published in PRAVDA.

The complexities of the upcoming election campaign and ways to surmount difficulties were spoken of by V. Shevchenko, chairman of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, A. Maselskiy, chairman of Kharkov Oblast Soviet Executive Committee [oblispolkom], A. Melnikov, chairman of Kherson Oblispolkom, and others.

"By analyzing the shortcomings of previous elections," A. Korniyenko, first secretary of Kiev Ukrainian Communist Party City Committee [gorkom], said, "we must ascertain over and over again the reasons for the decline in the party's prestige among the people and take specific steps to restore it. And one of our first such steps must be to nominate and support candidate deputies from among the respected, active Communists and nonparty people who work conscientiously, are popular in their labor collectives, and are ready to champion their interests in an honest and principled manner at any level. There is nothing more important for us party workers today than work among the masses."

It was stated that the success of the election campaign will largely depend on changes within the party itself. Pointing out that the section of the draft devoted to internal party problems needs serious additional work, K. Khirnyy, first secretary of Kharkov Ukrainian Communist Party Gorkom, shared this observation: A considerable proportion of Communists are still inert. And this is not always their fault. The bulk of the party is still alienated from politics. A gap is arising between the party's base—the primary party organizations—and the leading organs that stand above them.

It was correctly noted—there is both inertia and passivity, frequently concealed behind empty talk. During the plenum the presidium received notes from the hall requesting that speakers be reminded of the need to speak more concretely and to the point. But even after this there were speeches with general arguments and self-praising reports. Auditing Commission Member S. Tislitskaya, who criticized from the rostrum certain people who make empty promises, was asked by the chairman to name names on the assumption that some of them might be sitting in the hall. But she did not venture to do so. And all this was before the eyes not only of the plenum participants but also of the millions-strong television audience who watched a recorded relay from the session. How then are Communists to be subjected to sharp criticism at party meetings?

However, it is gratifying that there were more examples of a different kind at the plenum. Thus, making a number of amendments and suggestions with regard to the draft platform, Central Committee Member K. Sytnik leveled sharp, specific criticism at Ye. Kachalovskiy, deputy chairman of the Ukrainian SSR Council of Ministers and member of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo, and Yu. Kolomiyets, deputy chairman of the Ukrainian SSR Council of Ministers and candidate member of the Politburo, who were sitting in the presidium, and put

this question to the hall: Can they be left in the highest leading organ of the republic party organization?

Unfortunately, the plenum did not manage to get away from attacks on the press, which have sadly become traditional. And it is annoying that, while calling for consolidation in the struggle for perestroyka, certain leading party workers are inclined to accuse the press, radio, and television of many shortcomings, creating a kind of "enemy image" with enviable consistency from session to session. The speeches of N. Zadoya, first secretary of Dnepropetrovsk Oblast Committee [obkom], A. Myakota, first secretary of Poltava Obkom, V. Dikusarov, first secretary of Khmelnitskiy Obkom, and certain other speakers abounded with general, nonspecific rebukes addressed to journalists. This prompted the chairman to remind them that the mass media merely reflect the situation that has taken shape in society and, instead of accusing the press of highlighting particular shortcomings, it is necessary to concentrate efforts on eradicating them.

The plenum adopted a resolution on the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee platform for the elections of Ukrainian SSR people's deputies and the republic's local soviets and an appeal to all voters of the Soviet Ukraine.

A Central Committee commission was set up to generalize proposals on the party statutes and to draw up a draft action program of the Ukrainian Communist Party in connection with the preparations for the 28th CPSU Congress.

The plenum gave a firm assurance that the banner of the Ukrainian Party Organization was and still is the red banner, and its goal is socialism in the Leninist understanding of the word.

Ukrainian Plenum Approves Election Platform

LD0112203889 Kiev in English to North America 0030 GMT 30 Nov 89

[Excerpts] A plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine was held today [29 November] in Kiev. The following issues were put on the agenda:

- On the platform of the Communist Party of Ukraine Central Committee toward elections of people's deputies of the Ukrainian SSR [Socialist Soviet Republic] and local soviets in the republic;
- On setting a commission of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine to generalize the proposals toward party's new rules and working out a draft program of action of the Communist Party of Ukraine in connection with the preparations for the 28th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

The plenary meeting was opened by first secretary of the Central Committee, Vladimir Ivashko. He said in particular:

[Begin Ivashko recording in Ukrainian fading to English translation] The Politburo of the Central Committee believes that considering the character of the issue we discussed, we could each time choose a particular form of work of our plenary meeting not being bound by the old schemes. Perhaps this will provide for a fuller use of the intellectual, creative potential of all the members of the elected body for collective political decision-making, for searching for the most efficient solutions of all the problems of the republic's social life. They way we organized the work over the draft platform also speaks in favor of this type of approach. We proceed from the fact that this document should reflect the scope of opinions of the party members at large from the local party organisation to the Central Committee. [passage omitted]

In our opinion the draft now has a more businesslike nature as a result of all this work. A number of new provisions have been added. Worthy of mention are the provisions on the condemnation of the Stalinist crimes, the bureaucratic methods of management in the times of stagnation, the improvement of the living conditions of the war and labor veterans, the upgrading of women's rights in the society, on the (?attitudes to) independent associations and movements, on fighting crime, on realization of the sovereignty of the republic in its relations with foreign countries.

In elaborating the platform, the Central Committee Politburo proceeded from the task of reflecting our principled positions on the solution of the most important problems which especially trouble the people. In essence this is the highlight of the policy being conducted by the Communist Party of the Ukraine and the communists in the soviets of people's deputies.

The Politburo also proceeded from the fact that the platform must be realistic, honest, without naive fantasies and false promises. The mapped-out goals and ways to their solution will make it possible to improve the state of affairs and the life of people. [end recording]

Reporting on the results of the discussion of the draft platform and the commission of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine was Stanislav Gurenko, the second secretary of the Central Committee. In part he said:

[Begin Gurenko recording in Ukraine fading to English translation] On the whole, the documents have been assessed positively. The general opinion is that the draft platform managed to outline the major social, economic, political goals which will be the main targets of the party committees at the current stage of perestroyka. Members of the commission pointed out that it is necessary to honestly and openly tell the people about the actual problems, about the gap emerging between the aims of restructuring and today's practical results, to admit that

sometimes half-measures and not always well-grounded decisions were taken at all levels. And all this led to economic disorders and an increase in the consumer goods deficit, a decline in labor discipline and the growing crime rate. The commission members examined an issue of strengthening the thesis on raising the role of the party, the political vanguard of the society, to definitely (?retreat) from everything which today does not promote perestroyka, to disassociate ourselves from Stalinism, Brezhnevism, the command and administrative system, to unravel a consistent struggle against bureaucratic approach within the party apparatus and at all managing bodies. These amendments have found reflection in the final document. [end recording] [Passage omitted]

Proposals and amendments to the party's platform were sent to the editorial commission which updated the draft and submitted to the full-scale meeting. The meeting adopted the platform. The participants of the full-scale meeting also elected the commission which will generalize the amendments to the statute of the Communist Party and develop the program of action for the communists of the Ukraine, in connection iwth the preparations for the 28th Soviet Communist Party Congress.

The full-scale meeting also adopted the appeal of the Central Committee to the elctorate of the Ukraine. Vladimir Ivashko, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Ukraine's Communist Party had a closing speech at the meeting.

New Election Commission Described

90UN0380A Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 14 Nov 89 p 1

[Report on interview with V.F. Boyko, chairman of Tsentrizbirkom by a RATAU correspondent: "The Election Campaign Has Started"; date and occasion not specified]

[Text] **As has already been reported, a Central Electoral Commission on elections to people's deputies of the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] has been established in the republic. V.F. Boyko, chairman of Tsentrizbirkom [Central Electoral Commission], talks about the main directions of its work, the tasks it has to resolve, and the typical features of preparing for and conducting present-day elections, with a RATAU/Radio Telegraph Agency of the Ukraine correspondent.**

[Boyko] First of all, I would like to mention that the new laws on the elections of people's deputies adopted by the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet have an important feature: In contrast to the standards that have been in effect until now, they have entrusted practically all of the work for the preparation and conduct of elections, and all of the responsibility for their organization, to the electoral commissions that are being established in a democratic way. Previously, as is well-known, the executive committees of the soviets played a considerable role in the conduct of an election campaign. Thus, now there is assurance of real participation by the voters, work collectives, and public organizations themselves in the formation of the deputy corps.

The Law entrusts the management of the entire system of electoral commissions being created for the organization of elections of people's deputies of the Ukrainian SSR to the Central Electoral Commission. It is organized by a decree of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet on the basis of proposals of oblast and the Kiev city soviets, taking into account the proposals of work collectives, public organizations, meetings of collectives of educational institutions, voters according to place of residence, and servicemen.

Incidentally, I will remind the readers once more that the Central Electoral Commission is located at this address: 252008, Kiev-8, Ulitsa Sadovaya, 3.

[RATAU] Vitaliy Fedorovich, could you explain the powers of the Tsentrizbirkom in greater detail?

[Boyko] The Laws give wide powers to the Central Electoral Commission. It must organize the preparation for and the conduct of elections of Ukrainian SSR people's deputies, carry out inspections on adherence to the Law on Elections throughout the territory of the republic, and direct the activity of okrug and district electoral commissions.

In carrying out its powers, the Central Electoral Commission has the right to hear reports of ministries, state committees, and departments of the republic, and other state and public organizations on questions related to the preparation for and conduct of elections.

Still another important aspect of the activity of the Central Electoral Commission is the organization of the enrollment of voters, and review of their statements and complaints on decisions and actions of okrug and district electoral commissions. The Central Electoral Commission has the right to stop or suspend their activities, if they are contrary to the law in force. It is incumbent on the commission to decide questions related to the conduct of repeat elections and the election of deputies in place of those who have left, the organization of the recall of people's deputies, and the execution of other powers.

The first meeting of the Central Electoral Commission has already been held. A decision was made at it concerning the organization of electoral okrugs for the elections of people's deputies to the Ukrainian SSR—according to the new law, 450 people's deputies will be elected to the republic's Supreme Soviet instead of the 650 in the one currently functioning. Approval was also given to a calendar plan of measures for the preparation for and the conduct of elections of Ukrainian SSR people's deputies; an estimate of the expenditures of electoral commissions was approved, and a number of procedural questions were resolved.

[RATAU] Please describe the features of the initial stage of the election campaign.

[Boyko] This stage is very important. The entire course of the further stages of preparation for the elections, their conduct, and the determination of the results, depend on it to a great degree.

Meetings have already been held by work collectives or their soviets, organs of public organizations or their executive organs, collectives of educational institutions, voters according to place of residence, and servicemen according to military units, at which representatives have been nominated to okrug election commissions. On this basis, the appropriate oblast, Kiev and Sevastopol city soviets, or their executive committees, must organize these commissions not later than 18 November.

In connection with numerous questions that are coming to the Central Electoral Commission, it is necessary to note the following. Under Article 23 of the Law on Elections of People's Deputies of the Ukrainian SSR, the right to organize okrug commissions is granted to the indicated soviets or their presidiums. Inasmuch as there are no presidiums in the soviets of the current convocation, they will be formed in the newly elected soviets, and the decisions on the organization of okrug electoral commissions can be made by the committees of the appropriate soviets.

It would be advisable to heighten the attention—first of all of the Soviets of People's Deputies—on one more important question. After the completion of the formation of okrug electoral commissions, it is necessary everywhere to organize their training at conferences, seminars, and in practical work, so that each member of the commission has a good understanding of the new Law on Elections. As the elections to the USSR People's Deputies have shown, they will go through a condition that is not easy. Unusual situations and complicated questions will arise. Therefore, those who will be charged with the responsibility for organizing the preparation for and conduct of elections must be, as they say, fully armed. In the resolution of one or another question, one must be guided by the law, and only by the law. And to do this, it must be understood thoroughly.

[RATAU] Does the law secure for the public and the voters the right to check on the progress of preparations for and the conduct of elections? If yes, then how will this be done in practice?

[Boyko] The Law on Elections to People's Deputies of the Ukrainian SSR has a special article that firms the principle of broad glasnost in the organization of all stages of elections. Representatives from work collectives, public organizations, collectives of educational institutions, meetings of voters according to place of residence and servicemen according to military units, organs of state authority, and proxies for candidates for deputy, have the right to be present at meetings of electoral commissions—during registration of candidates for deputy, the counting of votes, the determination of the results of elections by okrug, and arriving at grand totals.

In addition, the law stipulates two requirements: First, that a statement on the desire to participate in a meeting be submitted to the commission 2 days before the meeting, and, second, those invited do not have a right to interfere in the work of the commission.

A special role in guaranteeing glasnost in the conduct of elections is relegated to the mass media. Its representatives are guaranteed free and unimpeded access to all gatherings and meetings relating to elections.

Ukrainian SSR Election Schedule Published

90UN0333B Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 1 Nov 89 p 1

[Decree of Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet: "On Scheduling Elections of Ukrainian SSR People's Deputies and Deputies of Local Soviets of People's Deputies of the Ukrainian SSR of the 21st Session"]

[Text] In keeping with the Constitution (basic law) of the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], articles 15 and 17 of the Ukrainian SSR Law "On Elections of Ukrainian SSR People's Deputies" and article 15 of the Ukrainian SSR Law "On Elections of Deputies of Local Soviets of People's Deputies," the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic hereby decrees:

1. To schedule elections of Ukrainian SSR people's deputies and deputies of local soviets of people's deputies of the republic of the 21st session on Sunday, 4 March 1990.

To extend the term of office of deputies of local soviets of people's deputies of the Ukrainian SSR of the 21st term until the election of deputies of local soviets of peoples deputies of the Ukrainian SSR of the new session.

2. To establish the norm of voters per one electoral okrug for elections of Ukrainian SSR people's deputies based on 82,200 voters.

[Signed] V. Shevchenko, chairman of the Presidium of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet;
N. Khomenko, secretary of the Presidium of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet
Kiev, 28 October 1989

Ukrainian SSR Election Committee Created

90UN0333C Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 1 Nov 89 p 1

[Decree of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet: "On the Formation of the Central Election Commission for Elections of Ukrainian SSR People's Deputies"]

[Text] Having considered the proposals of the executive committees of the oblast and Kiev city soviets of people's deputies and the republic organs of social organizations, on the basis of article 21 of the Ukrainian SSR Law "On Elections of People's Deputies of the Ukrainian SSR," the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic hereby decrees:

To form the Central Election Commission for elections of people's deputies of the Ukrainian SSR with the following composition:

Chairman of the Central Election Commission:

Boyko, Vitaliy Fedorovich—first deputy minister of justice of the Ukrainian SSR.

Deputy chairmen of the Central Election Commission:

Plyuta, Nina Iosifovna—lathe operater of the Irpenmash Plant in Kiev Oblast.

Tatsiy, Vasiliy Yakovlevich—rector of the F.E. Dzerzhinskiy Kharkov Juridical Institute.

Secretary of the Central Election Commission:

Litvin, Nikolay Alekseyevich—first deputy chief of the department of organizational-party and personnel work of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine.

Members of the Central Election Commission:

Aryayev, Nikolay Leonidovich—chief of pediatrics department No 2 of the faculty for improving physicians of the N.I. Porogov Odessa Medical Institute.

Bobrov, Nikolay Georgiyevich—chairman of the Chernigov Oblast Court.

Vartanov, Grigoriy Ivanovich—professor of the department of journalist of the Kiev Higher Party School, chairman of the republic creative union for questions of city-rayon and rayon newspapers.

Voronova, Lidiya Konstantinovna—chief of the department of state and administrative law of Kiev State University imeni T.G. Shevchenko.

Gavrilyuk, Lyubomir Vasilyevich—leader of brigade of fitters of the Zbarazhskiy sugar refinery in Ternopol Oblast.

Glushko, Aleksandr Kondratyevich—secretary of the board of the Union of Writers of the Ukraine, editor-in-chief of the magazine VITCHIZNA.

Goncharov, Nikolay Kharitonovich—miner at the S. Tyulenin underground mine of the Krasnodonugol production association, Voroshilovgrad Oblast.

Griniv, Vera Vasilyevna—deputy director of the Kalush secondary school No 2, Ivano-Frankov Oblast.

Gudimov, Yuriy Yakovlevich—major general, first deputy chief of the political adminsitration of the Red Banner Kiev military district.

Dikusarov, Vladimir Grigoryevich—first secretary of the Khmelnitsy obkom of the Communist Party of the Ukraine.

Erdeli, Karol Endreyevich—chairman of the Druzhba Kolkhoz in Beregovskiy Rayon in Transcarpathian Oblast.

Yevtushenko, Svetlana Sergeyevna—secretary of the Ukrainian trade union council, deputy chairman of the Ukrainian republic council of women.

Kirnenko, Valentin Ivanovich—department chief for questions of the work of the soviets of the Presidium of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet.

Kiseleva, Nina Nikolayevna—secretary of the Mariupol gorkom [city committee] of the Communist Party of the Ukraine of Donetsk Oblast.

Kopchenkov, Leonid Mikhaylovich—chairman of the Chernovitsy Oblast soviet of veterans of war and labor.

Ladogubets, Viktor Yuryevich—leader of tractor and field brigade of the Progress Kolkhoz in Sumskiy Rayon in Sumy Oblast.

Mazurenko, Svetlana Ivanovna—head physician of the Udarnik sanitorium in Yevpatoriya, Crimean Oblast.

Maselskiy, Aleksandr Stepanovich—chairman of the ispolkom [executive committee] of the Kharkov Oblast soviet of people's deputies.

Miroshnichenko, Vladimir Nikolayevich—second secretary of the Central Committee of the LKSM [Lenin Communist Youth League] of the Ukraine.

Mishchanin, Vasiliy Grigoryevich—director of the Zaporozhye hardware plant.

Orlov, Vadim Aleksandrovich—director of the Poltavagroproyekt cooperative state planning and research institute.

Polyarush, Oleg Yevgenyevich—rector of the Kirovograd State A.S. Pushkin Pedagogical Institute.

Remkha, Vladimir Mikhaylovich—deputy general director of the production association of mining and non-ore enterprises of the South (Yuzhruda) in Krivoy Rog in Dnepropetrovsk Oblast.

Skoropad, Mikhail Vasilyevich—senior operator of the Drogobychskiy oil refinery, Lvov Oblast.

Taranenko, Anna Ivanovna—milkmaid of the Krupskaya Kolkhoz in Cherkasskiy Rayon in Cherkassy Oblast.

Shubovich, Vladimir Ivanovich—chairman of the Kolkhoz imeni XXI Syezda KPSS in Kazatinskiy Rayon in Finnitsa Oblast.

Suvlova, Tamara Alekseyevna—weaver of the 1st factory of the Kherson cotton production association.

[Signed] V. Shevchenko, chairman of the Presidium of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet
N. Khomenko, secretary of the Presidium of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet
Kiev, 28 October 1989

Ukrainian SSR Proposes Election Experiment

90UN0333D Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 1 Nov 89 p 1

[Decree of Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet: "On Proposals for Conducting Elections of Deputies for Territorial and Production Electoral Okrugs as an Experiment"; signed by V. Shevchenko, chairman of the Presidium of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet, and N. Khomenko, secretary of the Presidium of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet, on 28 October 1989 in Kiev]

[Text] The Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic hereby decrees;

To instruct the Presidium of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet to consider the proposals of individual soviets of people's deputies concerning holding elections of deputies of local soviets from territorial and production electoral okrugs as an experiment. To develop and adopt temporary provisions for the organization of these elections.

Because of the need to take preparatory organizational measures, the elections of deputies of local soviets as an experiment are to be conducted on 25 March 1990.

Baku Enterprises End Strike 4 Dec

PM0512125389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Report by own correspondent Asim Dzhalilov under the rubric "Direct Line": "Situation Getting Back to Normal"]

[Text] Baku—Enterprises on strike in the city resumed work Monday [4 December]. This was made possible by the agreement reached between the republic leadership and representatives of the Azerbaijan People's Front. As IZVESTIYA has already reported, the decision to begin the strike action was made in connection with the publication of the USSR Supreme Soviet resolution "On Measures To Normalize the Situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast."

During the consultations between the republic leadership and the Azerbaijan People's Front, it was recognized that it would be expedient to study the document approved by the union parliament and suspend those articles which are not in agreement with the Constitution and the Law on the Sovereignty of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic.

The approved document will be published in the press. USSR people's deputies, specialists, and representatives of the public, including the Azerbaijan People's Front, are involved in drawing it up.

5-Point Earthquake Registered in Kirghizia

LD0412075889 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0000 GMT 4 Dec 89

[Text] Frunze, 4 Dec (TASS)—Yesterday, at 1251 hours Moscow time [0951 GMT], an underground tremor of 5 points was registered on the territory of Kirghizia. The epicenter of the earthquake, according to the data of the Institute of Seismology of the Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic Academy of Sciences, was 50km south of Osh.

Tremors of a strength of 3.5 to 4 points were felt in the villages of Iski-naukat, Sufi-kurgan, and the town of Osh. There were no casualties or damage.

Transport Vehicles Banned From Moscow

LD0512154789 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 5 Dec 89

[Text] As of 1 February next year, all state- or cooperative-owned goods vehicles in transit from other towns will be banned from entering Moscow. This decision was made by the executive committee of the Moscow Soviet on a recommendation from its temporary city committee to combat crime. There are many reasons for this. First, every tenth road accident is caused by vehicles from other towns. Second, the capital is suffering from severe pollution and 70 percent of all harmful emissions into the atmosphere can be blamed on transport vehicles. Information signs about these conditions will be set up at the 50 km limit on the approach to the city. As a result, those who come to Moscow next year for reasons other than business will have to bypass the city. Those who would like to stay in Moscow will be able to go under their own steam.

Moscow First Secretary, Others Interviewed

90UN0362A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Nov 89 Second Edition p 2

[Report on interview with Yu.A. Prokofyev, first secretary of the Moscow City Party Committee, and V.N. Senkov and S.A. Abramov, first secretaries of the Leninskiy and Tushinskiy Rayon Party Committees, conducted by Yu. Kazmin and V. Loginov: "Not a Repetition of What Has Gone Before"; in Moscow, date not given]

[Text] Moscow—PRAVDA receives dozens of letters daily with various thoughts about the restructuring in the party. It is noteworthy that party officials themselves, who even yesterday seemingly preferred "not to become

bogged down in debate" which, of course, was totally unjustified, are increasingly picking up their pens. "Who knows (and from within, as they say) better than the party officials the problems of renovating the CPSU which are being discussed virtually everywhere currently!" A. Khoroshun, a reader from Kuybyshev, writes. "Let them have their say on your pages a little more often, PRAVDA people. And if they still seldom write to the paper, seek interviews and invite them to 'round-tables'."

Some time ago the editorial office was visited by Moscow party officials. Yuriy Anatolyevich Prokofyev, who was then second and is now first secretary of the Moscow Gorkom [city party committee], and Vladimir Nikolayevich Senkov and Sergey Aleksandrovich Abramov, first secretaries of the Leninskiy and Tushinskiy Raykoms [rayon party committees], shared their thoughts with PRAVDA on the experience and problems of restructuring the work of the party committees.

Correspondents: PRAVDA readers are advocating increasingly demandingly a fundamental renovation of the style and methods of party leadership locally. In the opinion of many people, there has as yet been very little noticeable movement here. And there is altogether a special attitude toward perestroyka in the capital's party organization.

Yu. Prokofyev: Justified demands. They are our worries and concerns also. I recall how in June, shortly after the gorkom plenum which decided to conduct a debate in the city party organization on the role and place of the CPSU under the conditions of the political system under renovation, when we entered via television into open dialogue with Muscovites, I read the following comment in an overseas newspaper. The Moscow Gorkom, the newspaper wrote, was forced into this inasmuch as it is under the close scrutiny of everyone. The situation in the capital is the most complex, it was said, for all the radical-left and the most conservative forces are concentrated here in the main. The correspondent was clearly laying it on thick, but...where there's smoke there's fire.

Incidentally, there are 1.2 million communists in the capital. And 9 million inhabitants altogether—the equivalent of some countries. The situation, however, is little different from the general situation in the country. Both socioeconomic difficulties and political tension.... However, there is no intention of putting the blame on some people or other.

I shall say plainly that it was far from immediately that we realized what needed to be done and how. And we frequently adopted a formal approach to the restructuring of our work. Take the reorganization of the gorkom machinery. We reduced it by one-third and left just 7 of the 17 departments. And we thought: All that needs to be done has been done. Not so, in fact: We began initially to work not better but worse.

Correspondents: Why?

Yu. Prokofyev: We changed organizationally, but kept the functions and tasks essentially the same. As before, we involved ourselves directly in economic matters, only in fewer numbers now. The new ideological department, on the other hand, very sizable, continued to deal with "political education" in the old way.

The plenum which I have just mentioned was a turning point to some extent. In advocating debate we proceeded from the need for an acceleration of the processes of renovation in the life of the city party organization. On the street, among friends and at mass meetings people were speaking about party-wide, state-wide problems, but at the party meetings, frequently a "repetition of what had gone before": There a lathe had broken down, here interruptions in material-technical supply.... We set, first of all, the task of shaking up and politicizing, if it may be so put, the work of the primary party organizations, the raykoms and the gorkom. Second, ascertaining more fully in the course of the debate the views and positions of the communists in order to more confidently shape the program of the gorkom's subsequent activity and formulate proposals for the precongress platform of the CPSU Central Committee and the party rules. Third, finding new leaders and expanding the activists as far as possible thanks to people who are creatively and practically prepared for working in the new way.

The debate is underway, and although it is naturally taking up much time and effort, the benefit therefrom is palpable. Collating and constantly analyzing the opinions of the communists and nonparty people, on the activity of the gorkom and raykoms included, we are not waiting for a "summing up"—we are trying to update the style and methods of our work on the move, as they say.

Correspondents: In what areas primarily?

Yu. Prokofyev: The question of questions is the affirmation of the real supremacy of the elective party authorities over the apparatus. Three commissions—organizational-party and cadre work, ideological and socioeconomic—were formed from members of the newly elected gorkom back at the city party conference. The formation proceeded, I confess, creakingly. After all, it was initially still the apparatus which prepared the meetings and other actions of these committees and draft decisions and determined with what they would deal and how. Per the scenario approved by lengthy practice. It reached the point where people were complaining to me in the departments: The commissions...are no help to us in our work. I had time and again to remind my colleagues that it was not the elective body and not its commissions which should be helping the apparatus, but they the apparatus.

Correspondents: But, after all, the 19th All-Union Party Conference recorded in one of its resolutions: "It is impermissible for the party apparatus to substitute for

the elective authorities, and for the role of the communists to amount to attendance at meetings and voting for...ready-made draft resolutions."

Yu. Prokofyev. It is paradoxical that we have become accustomed in voting for this decision or the other and approving it even to the next day having forgotten about it. A general problem. It is for this reason, incidentally, that we are now paying paramount, I do not exaggerate, attention to supervision and the verification of execution.... And the gorkom commissions are today working as they are authorized to work—independently and increasingly efficiently. The members of the gorkom, I would note, have started to recognize that they are not extras and not wedding generals but leaders, endowed with the trust (and responsibility!) of the capital's party organization, and that their say in the determination of strategy and tactics and the solution of all questions, cadre included, is decisive. The mentality and approaches in people working in the Moscow gorkom apparatus are changing also.

V. Senkov: A party meeting was held in the apparatus of the Leninskiy Raykom [rayon party committee] literally a few days ago. It agreed to abide firmly by the following principle: The apparatus is the assistant and executor of the wishes of the elective authority.

Despite the fact that the raykom apparatus has been replaced recently and has become more skilled and militant, we are continuing to strengthen it. We have abandoned secrecy. We have announced via MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA—for the first time—open competition to fill five vacant instructor positions. Eighteen applications have already been received. And something else that is new. We recently organized an institute of nonstaff scientific consultants. They are both our advisers and, if you will, our opponents. Before our initiatives and developments find their way into practice, they now undergo the appropriate expert appraisal among specialists.... I could continue the account of the experience accumulated in the course of perestroyka, but it should be recognized that it is still nonetheless quite little.

Prokofyev: True. And many of our unfinished efforts and omissions were spotlighted at the time of the preparation and organization of the elections of USSR people's deputies. At that time we, together with the raykoms and other party committees, stated that we feared, you see, that if we attempted to actively influence the course of the campaign, we would thereby be impeding the free expression of the electorate. In politics, however, there is no "no man's land," and the vacuum which was formed was instantly filled by politicized groups and subgroups. And the second mistake was the initial rejection of the nominations which were made not by the party authorities.

Correspondents: Self-critical confessions. But, people learn from mistakes....

V. Senkov: From mistakes primarily, perhaps. It is not enough to confess them.... The gorkom has, in my view, comprehended the lessons of the elections very self-critically. A non-stereotyped attitude toward the analysis was adopted: It traced how the party authorities operated in various fields, and how the "informals" operated. Then it made comparisons. And was additionally persuaded that under the new, changed conditions we had been operating entirely incorrectly!

Yuriy Anatolyevich has spoken of the rejection of "others'" nominations. Why was this? Because of our inability and reluctance to adopt a respectful, tolerant attitude toward an opinion which was different from and, God forbid, at odds with the "official" opinion. We had, after all, "not studied" such a science previously. And even now not everyone is hurrying to master it. But in operating with the old methods and, further, underestimating and, at times, simply ignoring opinions which do not coincide with our "guidelines" we have frequently created conflict situations for ourselves.

A raykom plenum which examined ways of increasing the interaction of the rayon's party and Komsomol [Leninist Communist Youth League] organizations proved instructive for us also. On the eve thereof we held a series of meetings with 10th graders and school Komsomol organizers and young teachers. And they told us that they were being treated as equals for the first time.

S. Abramov: Daily informal communication with people, communication, I agree, on an equal basis, not via the presidium, not by means of commands and circulars, is the most important thing in our work.

The following question would seem to be of fundamental importance also. It is known that the party is organized per territorial and industrial characteristics. We recall the rules: The primary organizations are formed per the communists' place of work and are united by territory in rayon and city organizations. And so forth.... This is section 20. And only in section 52 is it said, as if in passing, that if necessary territorial organizations may also be formed (may not also, apparently) per the communists' place of residence. What kind of organizations these are we know: of pensioners, mainly.

And we admit that the gorkoms and raykoms believed for many years that the forward edge were the plants and factories, and the residential neighborhoods and microrayons, the deep rear. And very rarely did they direct their gaze in this direction. Note, incidentally, where the informal associations "went". To the work force? No, to the population. Where party influence was very weak.

Prokofyev: I would be exaggerating were I to maintain that we have already succeeded in changing the situation at the roots. But the returns from the measures being adopted by the party committees are becoming increasingly tangible, and this, we would note, is having a salutory effect on the people's mood.

A somewhat curious and at the same time instructive instance. About 4 months ago I met with the representatives of one movement. We chatted for about 3 hours, and, to our mutual satisfaction, many "points of contact" were found. And recently I had a telephone call from them. We wish, they said, to lodge a complaint against the raykom. What is the matter, I asked. "The raykom people," I heard in reply, "are seizing the initiative by methods which are not allowed. We had the idea of forming our own electoral club. But they, the plagiarists, went out and set up a dozen such clubs in the rayon. And we have just one...."

I could, of course, have argued with my companions about where the idea of "clubs" first originated and at the same time have reminded them that many ideas which the leaders of the "people's fronts" and every conceivable kind of movement are readily putting out as their own were derived by them from the resolutions of the 19th party conference. But... I called the raykom secretary. Albeit not immediately, I did persuade him that there should be no "dividing up: This is yours, this is mine." I advised him to give thought together with the "plaintiffs" about a mutually acceptable coordination of action prior to the elections to the local soviets.

Correspondents: "We" and "they" are on many people's lips today. To what, an ever-increasing number of PRAVDA readers is worrying, will we have brought perestroyka if we have forgotten how not only to understand, but also listen to one another? And the following topic is showing through in the letters increasingly distinctly: People's hope is for the consolidating role of the party.

Prokofyev: This is a central topic of the debate on the role and place of the CPSU under the new conditions. Over two-thirds of its participants—and these are communists, nonparty people, and representatives of all strata of society—consider the party the sole force which could consolidate people around it.

S. Abramov: Incidentally, lest the debate become an exercise in theorizing far removed from the realities of perestroyka, for which many of the present ambitious "chatterboxes" are very willing, the Tushinskiy Raykom has endeavored to translate it into the language of specific issues and situational tasks comprehensible to the majority of people. The debate has helped specify and to some extent clarify the raykom platform formulated earlier. The position pertaining to interaction with the amateur movements has been determined more precisely also. The raykom supports close creative collaboration with all who are motivated by concern for the success of perestroyka. And is opposed to any compromise with those who while arraying themselves in the bright clothes of "friends of the people" are driven by selfish intentions of discrediting the party, Soviet power, and socialism.

Incidentally, three quite large party organizations in the rayon advocated the incompatibility of membership in the CPSU and membership in the informal politicized organizations. A raykom plenum did not support this standpoint. It decided thus: A communist has a right to participate in any of them if its aims and activity are not contrary to CPSU policy.

V. Senkov: Nor should we lose sight of the party members "without position," so to speak. How many CPSU members there are, unfortunately, who for some reason or other still remember that they are communists only at work, but who, stepping across the threshold of the plant exit, become indifferent everyday inhabitants! We have long been speaking about this. With concern. And the upshot? We recently, using a computer, finally learned the number of communists working on the territory of the rayon and resident here also. Almost 4,500. We decided to try and put them together with the communists registered in the territorial organizations. We make no secret of the fact that our purpose is to strengthen party influence on the preparation and organization of the elections to the local soviets. The communists can and should, in my view, be more assertive in making their presence known, via the self-management committees specifically.

Correspondents: We recall that when the first such committee emerged in Moscow, some of the media reported that the party and soviet authorities were attempting to impede its formation....

Prokofyev: Nothing of the sort. The first such committee emerged in Brateyevo. The reason was the grim ecological situation which had taken shape there. And this public body was only just coming into being when the Moscow city soviet and the rayispolkom [rayon executive committee] and the raykom also supported the highly promising movement by joint efforts.

The gorkom considers it its duty to contribute to the development of self-management in the city. But it cannot be implanted from above. We implanted a great deal this way, and the result is well known.... Moscow has approximately 40 such committees so far. Approximately 100 are at the structuring stage. They have their own financial accounts, right of body corporate, and right to certify a school director, clinic chief physician, and precinct police officer. But some activists, let's face it, are saying: We do not need either rights or money. We should set up a "team" and...stir up the public, raise painful issues, and criticize the authorities. After all, where there are rights, there are duties and responsibility also! Nonetheless, the new public authorities are gaining strength and authority among Muscovites. The backbone of future people's deputies of local soviets is being formed, I am convinced, in these committees.

It is already the case that people are accustomed to hold the party committees to account for everything—whether it be shortcomings in the work of industry or trade, the state of law and order, housing. We do not, naturally, absolve ourselves of responsibility for the state of affairs in the city. Assimilating political methods of

influence, we are trying primarily to enhance the consciousness of the communists employed in various spheres and in specific areas.

S. Abramov: It is, it would seem, axiomatic that deeds are the main touchstone on which a person is tested. But one sees how rumor, not without the assistance of the media at times, extols yet another "idol" who has not lifted a finger for perestroyka or for people but who has, on the other hand, been highly successful in criticizing "party apparatchiks" and the "party-bureaucratic stratum". Naturally, I, like my colleagues, am not against criticism. The most acute and stinging even. Pertaining to work and for the sake of work! But why should one take things to heart when one is accused day in, day out of every mortal sin. It is these which are impermissible methods and dishonest struggle.... During and following clamorous mass meetings, whose organizers, campaigning for pluralism and freedom of speech, have snatched the microphones from my hands, I have asked the most zealous of our critics what they know of the party apparatus and its present-day business and concerns and, finally, of my work, that of a raykom secretary—10-12 hours a day, practically without days off. In response, smirks, more often than not.

You have probably heard about the leaflet put out by the Petrovskiy Raykom of approximately the following content: "Help the raykom hand over power to the soviets! Come and tell us how specifically this should be done." Our colleagues, consequently, were seething. After all, criticizing the party authorities, the raykoms particularly, sparing no caustic epithets, for being reluctant to give power to someone or other has become a tradition, virtually. To someone or other, to demagogues and bawlers, it is precisely these to whom we will not give it. But to the soviets—undoubtedly! But it is certainly clear to every impartial person that without a more decisive break with the administrative-command system and without the more dependable legal and other underpinning of the independence and, consequently, authority of the soviets, without their renewal, things will not go as intended. And I would very much like, I confess, what is intended to be accomplished more quickly. In order that everyone may get his job done. And be answerable for it.

Problems of Moscow Party, Soviets Examined

90UN0351A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 47, 25 Nov 89 pp 5-6

[V.T. Saikin, chairman of the Moscow City Soviet Executive Committee, interviewed by L. Novikova: "My Dear Capital..."]

[Text] A Moscow City CPSU Committee plenum was held recently; it elected Yu.A. Prokofyev first secretary of the Moscow Gorkom [City Party Committee]. Big, complex tasks confront the city party organization and the soviet authorities today. V.T. Saikin, chairman of the Moscow Gorispolkom [City Soviet Executive Committee], describes some of the problems to our correspondent L. Novikova.

[Novikova] Valeriy Timofeyevich, are you a native Muscovite?

[Saikin] Yes, I was born and grew up in Moscow, at 3, Kozhukhovskaya Street, now Trofimova Street, not far from the Likhachev Plant, where I subsequently worked, moving from foundry hand to general director. My father died in the war, and we were a large family and lived a hard life.

[Novikova] Moscow is not only the city in which we live, it is the capital of a huge power. Millions of Soviet people and foreign visitors come here every day. Moscow was for a long time considered a "model city," the "best city in the world". But when B.N. Yeltsin became first secretary of the Moscow Gorkom, we sadly learned that not only was not everything here as good as we had thought but even worse than in many cities of our country: the air which we breathe and the products which we lack, transport operates inadequately, infant mortality is high here and much, much else, of which we were earlier ignorant. Why has this happened?

[Saikin] There are two sides to the coin here. On the one hand, we earlier really did embellish a great deal and attempted to show the best side of everything. But then we decided that we were acting wrongly and turned the other way—we began to show the facts to be gloomier than they in fact were. The city is truly in a difficult situation: its master plan was geared to a maximum of 8.5 million inhabitants by 1995. Plans for the construction of housing, general amenities and the entire infrastructure were compiled in accordance therewith. Indeed, frankly speaking, there were neither resources nor forces for any more.

But what has happened in actual fact? Almost 9 million persons are living in the city already. And this means a different reckoning, a different need for housing, kindergarten, transport, stores. And if we add to this the fact that not all is well with us throughout the country either now! It has to be understood that people come to Moscow not only for culture and not "for the songs" but for goods. Our entire domestic "tourism" is geared to this. You can see how many tourist buses there usually are standing around the store "sights" being "studied" by tourists. This complicates the operation of all municipal services, which operate under great strain. After all, to the 9 million Muscovites we have to add up to 3 million visitors plus 6 million inhabitants of Moscow Oblast, many of whom also come to Moscow for all they need. Some 18 million altogether. This is what Greater Moscow means today. Of course, not one area of the municipal economy is geared to this number here. And all this is reflected in the city's morale and psychological climate. Here is yet another aspect of our difficulties. If we look today at the demographic composition of the population, everything here also is taking shape far from to the city's benefit. Of the 9 million, 2 million are pensioners, more than 2 million are children and students of schools, VUZ's [higher educational institutions] and technical schools, approximately 1 million people

are employed in research and support services therefore and approximately 140,000 persons work in the administrative machinery. But only 2.5 million persons work in the material production sphere, including 1.2 million in industry. And we have practically no reserves in the municipal economy for replenishment of worker personnel in either industry or construction. And if the manpower shortage is such, if we ourselves have such a need therefore, there is also a corresponding attitude toward work among many people.

[Novikova] We will no longer bring in the "special-quota" workers?

[Saikin] We will continue to invite small numbers of them: for Metro construction and in small numbers for the Likhachev Auto Plant and the Leninist Komsomol [Communist Youth League] Auto Plant. In certain cases ministries or departments will request the registration of some top specialist for their sectors. But these will be exceptions. The manpower situation here has become even more complicated with the creation of the immense number of cooperatives.

[Novikova] Valeriy Timofeyevich, look how dirty Moscow is today! You have been to other capitals, after all—the streets there are clean. Could we borrow their experience?

[Saikin] Moscow has become dirtier, and we have become more demanding and critical. Of course, order could be brought to bear in Moscow by a suspension of all construction. But there is today under ground a colossal amount of supply lines, which are 50 years old and more and for this reason are in need of maintenance. Streetcar track is being relaid. You can see houses in scaffolding, in the center particularly—all this creates inconveniences and dirt. But Moscow can no longer live without doing this work. I believe we will have to be patient for 2 or 3 years. Whereas earlier 25 km of various supply lines were relaid, the figure is now 140 km. That there is much filth in the yards and near the trash bins is another matter. Both inadequate cleaning and our general low standards are reflected here.

Or take another aspect of this problem. There has in recent years been a great growth in the street network of public eateries, and we are opening from 100 to 200 additional outlets a year, and the garbage cans have remained the same—intended only for cigarette butts. And there are tens of thousands of them. They should have been replaced by new ones. Larger cans have now appeared in many areas in the city, and there is no garbage around them, as a rule. Caretakers are a problem also. There are currently about 8,000 of them in the city, 10 times fewer than there were previously.

[Novikova] Consequently, hardware is needed. But our main implement is, as before, the broom.

[Saikin] Equipment must unfailingly be acquired—small, vacuum equipment. Depots and heated garages are needed for this. We lack such equipment, despite the presence of the Academy of Municipal Services and a multitude of institutes. So we in the Moscow City Soviet decided to have them made on the basis of national engineering (the chassis are made by the auto-manufacturing enterprises, and the mounted equipment, by the republic Ministry of Highways). Seventy of the first powerful road-sweeping and watering vehicles have already been produced.

So there are the shoots of something good here, only they have not been noticed as yet, and the press writes mainly about negative things. After all, as I joke, 100,000 persons attend a mass meeting here, but for the vegetable harvesting you cannot assemble 200.

[Novikova] I have heard that you, Valeriy Timofeyevich, go on your off days "potato-ing"....

[Saikin] What's good about this? I do this from desperation if only by my example to attract others. After all, the countryside today is also setting conditions: unless you help us, we will adopt plans which we can fulfill on our own, that is, 10 times less. However difficult, we not only fulfilled but overfulfilled by more than 2 percent the potato and vegetable planting. And this means that no more, no less than 582,000 tons plus of potatoes and almost 440,000 tons of vegetables have been transported into the city and laid in for winter storage for Muscovites.

[Novikova] Please tell us how much our capital costs?

[Saikin] Moscow's budget is approximately R4 billion. The budget deficit amounts to R265 million. But the deficit is growing. Here is an example. Earlier we bought potatoes from the village for 13 kopecks per kilo and sold them for 10 kopecks. Now, however, in connection with the introduction of contract prices, farms of Bryansk, Kaluga, Moscow, Ryazan and Smolensk oblasts and the Belorussian and Estonian SSR's [Soviet Socialist Republics] are selling them to us at 20-25 kopecks per kilo, explaining this by the transition to territorial cost accounting and self-financing. A similar situation is taking shape in respect of other vegetable crops also. And this means that the deficit in the municipal budget will grow even more, despite the fact that we have begun selling potatoes at 20 kopecks a kilo.

[Novikova] How is it planned to eliminate this deficit?

[Saikin] By overfulfillment of the plans and an improvement in the economic activity of the enterprises and from the corresponding taxes on local and union industry.

[Novikova] Valeriy Timofeyevich, what is your attitude toward the fact that enterprises are trading mainly now by way of orders and coupons? Will we not altogether be "imprisoning" Moscow in coupons?

[Saikin] Whether we "imprison" the capital in coupons or not will depend not on how we trade but how and how much we produce. Moscow does indeed receive more consumer goods than others and produces more.

[Novikova] And do you yourself visit the stores?

[Saikin] Of course I do. Commodity turnover here this year has grown by R1 billion and will continue to grow. But everything is being taken out of Moscow. We introduced coupons for sugar, and its consumption declined by a factor of 2.5. It is bad, of course, that we are engaged in business at the enterprises. But were we to leave the enterprises, the speculators would buy up everything instantly and resell. Many people have a tremendous amount of ready cash, and whoever is rich would become even richer on the basis of the commodities in short supply, and the poor person, even poorer. Involvement in commerce at the enterprises is a decision of the Moscow City Soviet. I am being rebuked and abused for it, but I am sure that there will be something for the workers in this system.

We shall make no secret of the fact that Moscow has today become a transshipment point. Forty percent of commodities comes to Moscow and then bypasses it and is delivered to various parts of the country. We divert loaders and workers and transfer from one railroad track to another, and multi-ton trucks speed through the city, breaking up the roads. In what other capital may as many trucks be seen as in Moscow? We have now told all enterprises with rail entries that freight will no longer be delivered to them from railroad stations by Moscow city motor transport. We are now also fighting to see that the wholesale depots working for the country withdraw from Moscow. We need to relieve the city of functions which are not its business. But, nonetheless, the whole trouble is that in industry today, Moscow industry included, wages are outstripping productivity. And this means an accumulation of money and a lack of goods. For this reason it is time for everyone to understand that we need to work and work to a high standard.

[Novikova] Valeriy Timofeyevich, what kind of privileges do Moscow City Soviet officials, yourself particularly, enjoy?

[Saikin] The privileges of officials of the Moscow City Soviet are many duties and much responsibility and criticism. As for me, my wage is R620, that of my deputies, R550. When I was the director of the Likhachev Auto Plant, I received 30-40 percent more. My dacha is state-owned, and I may further receive medical treatment at a Fourth Main Administration clinic (but I do not go there) and take a holiday in a sanatorium of the same main administration.

[Novikova] And where does your wife do her shopping?

[Saikin] At the store or avails herself of the orders at her place of work.

[Novikova] Has there been a reduction in the machinery of the Moscow City Soviet? Has it begun to operate better?

[Saikin] Yes, by 30 percent. A superfluous apparatus is harmful too, but it is also bad when it is too small. I believe that the workforce should have a workload just a little greater than it is capable of tackling. With the endowment of the rayons with a certain independence and the transfer to them of individual functions we will be able to reduce our staff still further. We are handing over some of the members of the apparatus whom we are releasing to the rayons.

The city's future will depend on the kind of body of deputies which is elected, the extent to which they are competent people, on how far they are devoted to the cause of socialism in our country and the extent to which they are responsible, state- minded people and on whom they elect as soviet and ispolkom chairmen.

[Novikova] Will you be running?

[Saikin] I have not yet decided. As a specialist, I could work just as productively elsewhere. If it is considered that the present working day is from 8 in the morning until midnight, working in industry would certainly be easier. But I have grown to love the city with all its present-day problems and shortcomings. And what is being criticized today pains me. I am disposed to contine working, I have both the desire and the health for this. But in order to make the final decision I must sense the support of the public, of Muscovites.

[Novikova] And you do not?

[Saikin] It is there in the Moscow City Soviet apparatus, but among Muscovites, I would not like to say. After all, everything that is happening in the city today and being criticized in the press—all this is being linked with the inadequate work of the Moscow City Soviet. This is justified to a large extent, but what a grim "legacy" we were bequeathed!

[Novikova] Have you attended the mass meetings? What is your attitude toward them?

[Saikin] Bad. In the 2 years in which we have been holding meetings what have we resolved? What have we created at the mass meetings? I shall give you an example. There was once opposite the Moscow City Soviet a mass meeting with placards of the "The Moscow City Soviet Is Making the People Drunkards" type. Our officials went out and said: "What are you holding a meeting here for, the wine store line is next door, go there. They did not, of course—they would, after all, have been beaten up. It is not mass meetings which determine our life today. But they show yet again that there are many insufficiently occupied persons in Moscow currently. And mass meetings do not put goods on the shelves, we need to work. No one will send us anything—neither the Americans nor the French: we must ourselves earn what we need to live on. The following thought may be traced distinctly today: everything is good for "them," for "us" all is bad. That things are bad with us is true, but that all is well with them is not entirely the case. They also have many problems. Let us take the environment. I shall cite France, Paris, as an example. I have visited Paris and have seen that in

ecology the also have many problems. And traffic is more of a oblem there than with us—narrow streets, traffic "jams". One further shortage has arisen—of patriotism. And from this a reluctance to work, and the remaining shortages develop from this also. But the possibilities of our people, intelligent, competent, are today colossal.

[Novikova] But, after all, in the same Paris the workers receive more than in our country by an order of magnitude. And, after all, being determines consciousness....

[Saikin] Yes, the living standard is higher there, but it is not just a question of this. They work there so much better and more productively, after all. In saying that we all need to work I meant not only the working class but also the numerous people working in science, culture and the public organizations, formal and informal.

[Novikova] Valeriy Timofeyevich, let us inject a little optimism in our discussion....

[Saikin] The greatest optimism is elicited by the fact that, despite all the difficulties, the work force of Moscow is providing for the successful fulfillment of the 5-year plan and the plan of the current year in terms of all the main indicators. Let us take the housing problem. This year alone Muscovites have already obtained just under 2 million square meters of housing, including 400,000 square meters for the house-building cooperatives. There has been a substantial reinforcement this year also of the social sphere: 21 schools, 23 preschool establishments, 5 clinics, 3 automatic telephone systems of more than 7,000 numbers, 72 commercial enterprises, 53 public eateries, a maternity home and other facilities which people greatly need have been commissioned.

The task of an improvement in the environmental situation is being tackled. Theaters and other public buildings are being modernized. It cannot be seen as yet but we are installing a new foundation beneath the Malyy Theater. We are completing the renovation of the History Museum and the Metropol Hotel. We will soon start to build several dozen new hotels, which are to be an important item of the city's revenue.

Much depends today on our general culture, culture of communication, and mutual understanding, which is at a very low level. Let us state plainly, a negative role has been performed by our press and television here.

[Novikova] You do not like the press?

[Saikin] I attach enormous significance to the press. I value highly its role in the molding of public opinion and the public consciousness. It has changed abruptly in the years of perestroyka under the conditions of glasnost and become far more profound, substantative and interesting. But is it normal when a way of life which is uncharacteristic of us is propagandized and when so much is being written about sex and violence? And it is not just in the press that such "material" is encountered. It is being shown in the movie theater also. And children are seeing all this. It is always easier piling up sensations and cheap stuff—some criminal case or other and sex. But showing man's spiritual world, showing the image of the new man—this is more difficult. I recall how the movie "Aleksandr Nevskiy," which, as boys, we all rushed to see, and ones like it came out during the war. What a patriotic role they performed! But one would hardly think that anyone would be seriously pondering our society's moral and psychological climate following "Little Vera".

I particularly like to read the letters published in newspapers and magazines. The working class is expressing its thoughts clearly and without beating about the bush, and it can be seen how it is enduring all that is happening.

Zaykov Visits Automobile Factory

90UN0285A Moscow VECHERNYAYA MOSKVA in Russian 1 Nov 89 p 1

[Article by Moscow TASS correspondent: "AZLK: A Business Attitude"]

[Text] We are only a few days away from the October holiday and the workers' capital is preparing to greet it properly. Muscovites know that the success of perestroyka depends not on useless meetings or high-flown words but on genuine economic progress.

Over these days, the ZIL, Trekhgorka and Krasnyy Proletariy collectives and those of other flagship industries in the capital are working confidently. The Leninskiy Komsomol Automobile Plant [AZLK], visited on 31 October by Politburo member, CPSU Central Committee Secretary and Moscow Gorkom First Secretary L. N. Zaykov, is looking for new ways to do things.

Director General V.P. Kolomnikov, Partkom Secretary V.O. Lyubimtsev, and STK Chairman and USSR People's Deputy D.M. Iovlev talked about the fact that the AZLK is going all-out to rebuild and convert to a new model of automobile. This is a complicated matter, however, and naturally it has its problems. The plant is unable to meet the vehicle output in the plan right now, internal and external reserves still have not been identified, and expensive equipment and labor resources are not always used efficiently. A fundamental renewal of production does not promise an easy life even in the near future, but at this enterprise they see their salvation not in short-term gains but in the acceleration of scientific and technical progress and improvement of the working and living conditions of the plant workers.

Here, creative examination is directed at resolving not only current but also long-term problems. They have developed a program to increase production of passenger and passenger truck vehicles and also to expand the variety of other consumer goods during the years 1991-1995. In particular, they intend to achieve a production volume of 300,000 cars by 1993.

To do this, in the opinion of experts, it will be necessary to increase the capacity of the leading enterprise, to create new workshops in the capital and to start up a new plant to produce higher class engines.

No later than 1993, with the participation of Italian firms, they plan to create the capacity to produce 60 thousand advanced seven-passenger Moskvich-2139 automobiles, and also to start producing jointly with CSSR enterprises trucks and the Moskvich-3733 passenger truck vehicles designed by Soviet and Czech specialists. To this end, the Moskvich Production Association is transferring a number of enterprises, the construction of which was postponed in past years. This transfer will allow the enterprise to gain valuable time and material resources. At the same time, they plan to establish shops for the yearly production of 300 thousand modern freezers and refrigeration compressors.

This interesting business conversation continued in the workshops and shop areas of the AZLK at a meeting with the active party and economic workers of the factory. Workers, engineers and designers were interested in the progress of political reform and radical economic transformation. They spoke about the necessity of doing everything possible to accelerate perestroyka, to consolidate social forces and to resolve pressing problems. It was noted that, first and foremost, discipline and order must be tightened and waste and laziness must be combated in every work place. The resolution of social problems also depends a great deal on the actions of management, and party and STK trade union organizations. The workers are always ready to respond with action to their needs and concerns.

After answering the questions of those present, L.N. Zaykov offered his holiday good wishes to the enterprise's workers and wished them success in accomplishing their large-scale plans. He stressed that today the outcome of the revolutionary renewal begun by the party depends on the work and creative initiative of everyone. Perestroyka is a continuation of the October Revolution and a rebirth of the Leninist view of socialism. Democratization processes, the extension of openness and radical economic transformations are changing our society and making our ideas more attractive.

Active workers of the rayon party organization held a meeting at the party's Lyublin Raykom. First Secretary of the CPSU raykom V.L. Ivanov spoke about the work and plans of the Lyublin communists to increase the leadership role of the party organizations, to renew the forms and methods of party work and to prepare for the 28th CPSU Congress and the local Council elections. Questions also came up about converting the rayon to cost accountability and local self management, and about carrying out the territorial industrial branch program Progress-95.

Accompanying L.N. Zaykov were Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers I.S. Silaev, Automotive and Agricultural Machine Building Minister N.A. Pugin, Secretary of the Moscow Gorkom V.I. Kuznetsov, and Deputy Chairman of the Moscow Gorispolkom I.M. Golovkov.

Slyunkov Speaks at Scientific, Engineering Plenum

90UN0341A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
22 Nov 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "In the Main Directions"]

[Text] The policy pursued by the party geared to an extension of the democratization of the country's social life is sharply enhancing the role of the organizations uniting the scientific and engineering-technical intelligentsia in the accomplishment of fundamental tasks of perestroyka and the reinforcement of its material basis.

The USSR Scientific and Engineering Societies (NIO) Union and all its components are persistently tackling tasks pertaining to the creation of conditions conducive to the development of initiative and the fullest manifestation of the creative capabilities of scientists, engineers, specialists and production innovators. A number of new public creative formations has been formed. Their activity is contributing to the consolidation within the framework of the union of broad circles of the S&T community for the purpose of acceleration of the elaboration of promising directions of S&T progress.

N.N. Slyunkov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, took part in the plenum.

S&T progress, he said in his speech, has always been and will continue to be a key direction of party strategy.

It was emphasized at the recent meetings in the CPSU Central Committee with economists and at the all-union scientific-practical conference on problems of radical economic reform that the efficiency of our economy is determined by the degree of impact of the reform on an acceleration of S&T progress.

Encompassing the whole world, the S&T revolution is in the full sense turning people's whole way of life upside down. We, however, are as yet lagging behind here.

I believe that the NIO Union, uniting more than 12 million scientists, engineers, specialists and advanced workers, could and is obliged to make an appreciable contribution to the accomplishment of the tasks set by life. It is important to engage the entire tremendous creative potential of the scientific community. Your work should be geared to the decisive advancement of S&T progress in the economy and the achievement of a fundamental breakthrough here.

The reform's first steps have shown the need for a search for fundamentally new approaches to the formation of socioeconomic, S&T, investment and structural policy. The plan for 1990 maps out appreciable structural changes and a turnabout of all sectors of the economy toward satisfaction of Soviet people's needs.

The clear course toward the social reorientation of the economy and the accelerated solution of urgent social problems: An increase in the production of food and consumer goods and services and housing construction, the development of health care and education, the improvement of pensions and solution of the ecological problem has been clearly set.

Considerable resources are needed for this. The new pension reform will require R29 billion, and with regard for the urgent measures pertaining to an improvement in pensions which are already being implemented, R35-36 billion a year. This is more than twice as much as all the state's centralized spending in respect of a rise in the people's living standard per the current 5-year plan. A draft new law on leave has been prepared. Solution of the housing problem and realization of the ecology program will require extensive resources. A further difficulty of the situation is that we have a budget deficit and large domestic national debt.

A way out of this situation on the basis of the traditional development of the economy is impossible. The problems which have arisen may be solved only on the paths of radical economic reform and an acceleration of S&T progress. What are needed are not simply a change in the level of technology and production and an increase in the return on capital.

A qualitative replacement of the productive forces based on the most progressive achievements of world science is needed. There is an urgent need for the implementation in a short period of time of large-scale and radical structural changes geared primarily to the elimination of the lag in microelectronics, information science and energy-and resource-saving.

The high resource consumption of the economy which has come about with us could lead not only to a blocking of an increase in production but also to a raw material and ecological crisis. For this reason the recovery and production of fuel and raw material resources are set for next year at the minimum permissible amount.

Up to one-half of all investments is now being channeled into the raw material sector of the economy. It is known here that savings of primary raw material resources thanks to the use of progressive base technology and materials requires two to three times fewer capital investments than for an increase in their recovery. The task of the utmost economies in resources and the conversion of resource-saving into a decisive source of satisfaction of requirements in raw material, intermediate products, fuel and energy is not new.

But there has been no fundamental breakthrough here as yet. The economy is still incurring huge losses in the recovery and processing of raw material, in the harvesting and procurement of agricultural products and in the shipment, storage and use of all kinds of material resources. These losses are comparable to the annual amount of capital investments in housing construction.

We have today to set the urgent task of assimilation of the potential of the resource-saving technology which has been accumulated in the world. After all, the material- and energy-intensiveness of the national income with us is considerably higher than in the developed countries.

Having then dwelt on specific areas of resource-saving in the economy, N.N. Slyunkov emphasized that the principal solution here is not only the elaboration of programs and plans, important as they are, but the use of efficient economic measures for influencing a policy of resource-saving. They should be provided for in the new economic mechanism. And a high technical standard and the inculcation of thrift and carefulness are also necessary, of course. In all this, he said, we are counting on your constructive contribution.

How is one to rectify the current situation? A meeting in the CPSU Central Committee Socioeconomic Policy Commission was devoted to a search for an answer to this very question. The problem of an improvement in the management of S&T progress under the conditions of radical economic reform was examined.

It was the general opinion of the participants in the discussion that it was necessary primarily to create new-generation technology capable of ensuring not a small-percentage but a manifold increase in productivity and resource-saving. This may be done only on the basis of the preferential development of basic and applied science. Then, employing the achievements of science, it is necessary to saturate the economy with producer goods of a high engineering level, and the socialist market, with high-grade consumer goods.

But the main thing is not only developing progressive S&T products. It is essential to make the economy receptive to them. Consequently, we need to place the economy as a whole and each enterprise in particular in conditions whereby their economic development is impossible without the introduction of new developments. It is essential that each component of the new economic mechanism currently taking shape be geared to an acceleration of S&T progress.

State policy in the sphere of the development of science and technology must be active.

The former strategy of a simple reduction in the technology gap in respect of industries which have already taken shape in progressive countries would condemn the country to a chronic technology lag.

We need a strategy of preferential technical-economic development with the concentration of the available S&T potential in the key areas of the new technological structure. A principal component of the new strategy should be choice of priorities. It is necessary for this to abandon the frontal solution of problems of S&T progress and the mistaken practice of the artificial substitution of the priorities of the sectors for true priorities of the development of science and technology. It is

necessary to shape an efficient mechanism of distinguishing the priority areas and rendering them in centralized manner all-around organizational and economic support.

It is necessary to pay the most serious attention to the formulation of new approaches to planning as a principal lever of implementation of a uniform S&T policy. It is via centralized management that it is necessary to ensure the concentration of forces and resources on the solution of major problems determining the strategic directions of S&T progress. The structure of the system of scientific organizations should acquire mobility making it possible to respond to the emergence of new functions in the structure of scientific activity.

Investment policy must be fundamentally reoriented in accordance with the priorities. It is essential here to pursue a policy of the large-scale reallocation of resources. It is necessary to channel them from the traditional directions of research and outdated industries into the new directions, whose development will lead to a profound restructuring of the economy. The immediate elaboration of economic levers of the management of S&T progress, including tax, financial and credit, price and depreciation allowances, and other components of the mechanism of realization of innovations are needed.

Financing from the state budget should be concentrated only on priorities. Appropriations per competitive review must become the rule. A decision on the allocation of resources should be made only given the participation of public authorities and scientific councils. This will make it possible to overcome monopolism.

An efficient system of the extension of preferential credit for progressive areas of science and technology must be devised, conditions for the accelerated depreciation of fixed capital created and a system of innovative commercial banks formed.

A flexible system of taxation of profits, and not their normative distribution, should be made the basis of the economic mechanism of innovative activity. Tax allowances should be geared to ensuring industry's economic interest in the use of the latest achievements of science and technology.

And, finally, a considerable restructuring of the organization of science itself is required. The principle component therein should be an outfit working on contract on a specific problem, and not the institute. This will make it possible to channel resources not into the upkeep of institutes but into the accomplishment of important S&T assignments. It is necessary to make more active use of the potential of VUZ [higher educational institution] science, where more than one-third of the country's scientific workers and half of all doctors and candidates of sciences are concentrated.

State plans and major projects and programs must necessarily undergo highly skilled and objective public expert appraisal.

A special body—the USSR Public Expert Appraisal Committee—has already been created. This is good. Its findings will be necessary also for the molding of correct public opinion, on such issues which are so troubling the community today as the location of chemical works, nuclear power and others included.

We, the speaker said, support the union's initiative in the creation and development of a system of continuous education in the country and the practice via Soviet and overseas engineering societies of the extensive mutual fieldwork and training of specialists in the latest fields of science and technology. It is good that you are studying and disseminating progressive forms of S&T activity. The practice of the work of the Belorussian NIO Board has been examined today, and pretty good experience has been accumulated in Siberia.

A decision was adopted in the CPSU Central Committee Socioeconomic Policy Commission to present a specific program at an all-union conference on problems of the management of S&T progress and provide an answer as to the kind of economic mechanism which needs to be created for S&T progress to become an inalienable component of our economy. We ask that the union join actively in the preparation of this conference and expect of you profound proposals aimed at the creation of an efficient concept of the management of S&T progress in the country.

In conclusion N.N. Slyunkov wished the NIO members creative success in practical work, a further strengthening of the alliance of the S&T intelligentsia and the working class and a consolidation of efforts in a key area of perestroyka.

The USSR Physics Society, the All-Union Aircraft Manufacturers Society and the USSR Nuclear Society became new members of the NIO Union at the plenum.

Members of the USSR Academy of Sciences A.Yu. Ishlinskiy, I.V. Gorynin and N.N. Moiseyev, A.V. Stepanenko, vice president of the Belorussian Academy of Sciences, M.S. Vysotskiy, member of the Belorusssian Academy of Sciences, V.Ye. Matveyev, general director of the "Biotekhnologiya" Science and Production Association, M.V. Irkhalova, chairman of the Textile and Light Industry Workers Union Central Committee, engineers, economists and specialists in various sectors of the national economy participated in discussion of the issues examined.

The plenum adopted an appeal of the USSR NIO Union to the workforce councils of all sectors that they unite efforts for the utmost increase in the efficiency of social production based on an acceleration of S&T progress and responsibility for the end results of work, on which the growth of Soviet people's well-being depends.

Further on Address

LD2211003589 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1559 GMT 21 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, 21 Nov (TASS)—Scientific-technical progress has always been and will continue to be one of the key directions of party strategy. It is not only a most important economic reserve, but is also a vital condition for the restructuring of the country's economy and for solving urgent social problems. This was stated by Nikolay Slyunkov, member of the Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, speaking today at a plenum of the Union of USSR Scientific and Engineering Societies (SES). He noted that this union, which unites more than 12 million scientists, engineers, specialists, and front-ranking workers, is able to and is committed to making a substantial contribution to solving tasks set by life. It is important, the CPSU Central Committee secretary noted, to bring into play the whole huge creative potential of the scientific public.

The CPSU Central Committee secretary went on to say that the first steps of economic reform have shown the need for a search for fundamentally new approaches to shaping socioeconomic, scientific-technical, investment, and structural policy. Earmarked in the 1990 plan are serious structural changes and a move on the part of all branches of the national economy toward satisfying the requirements of Soviet people.

A course has clearly been taken toward the social reorientation of the economy and an accelerated solution to urgent social problems: An increase in food production and the production of consumer goods and services, housing construction, the development of the health services and education, improving pensions and solving the ecological problem.

Nikolay Slyunkov said that today an urgent task must be set: To master the potential of resource-saving technologies which have accumulated in the world. After all, the material and energy consumption of our national income is higher than in the developed countries.

Having dwelled then on the specific tendencies of resource saving in the national economy, Nikolay Slyunkov stressed that the main way out here was not only in the elaboration of programs and plans, although they were also necessary, but in the application of effective economic measures of influence on the policies of resource saving.

The secretary of the CPSU Central Committee drew the attention of the plenum's participants to the necessity of drawing up new approaches to planning as the main linchpin in the implementation of a single scientific and technical policy. It is precisely through centralized management, he said, that it is necessary to guarantee the concentration of forces and means to resolve major problems determining the strategic trends in scientific and technical progress.

An important factor in the acceleration of scientific and technical pogress, it was noted further in the speech, is the extention of foreign economic links. The technological revolution, NIkolay Slyunkov said, is global in character, and to move forward alone means to fall behind. Advanced positions these days are only possible if there is integration into world economics and an international division of labor, including in the sphere of science and technology. For this reason, it is essential to make a transition from the traditional forms of exchange to a profound and all-embracing cooperation.

The Physics Society of the USSR, the All-Union Society of Aircraft Builders, and the Nuclear Society of the USSR became new members of the SES at the plenum.

The plenum adopted the address of the Union of Scientific and Engineering Societies to the councils of labor collectives of all industries with its call to unite efforts with the aims of raising the effectiveness of public sector production on the basis of an acceleration of scientific and technical progress and responsibility for the end results of work—on which the growth in the wellbeing of Soviet people depends.

KGB Official on Protecting State Secrets

90UN0297A Moscow PRAVITELSTVENNYY VESTNIK in Russian No 22, Nov 89 p 12

[Victor Aleksandrovich Ugarov, head of the subdivision of the USSR KGB responsible for protecting state secrets, interviewed by Correspondent G. Lomanov: "SECRET—But Why?"]

[Text] **Our correspondent, G. Lomanov talks about real and spurious secrecy with V. Ugarov, head of the subdivision of the USSR KGB responsible for the problem of protecting state secrets.**

[Correspondent] Victor Aleksandrovich, let us begin with an unhappy recollection. Many years ago, I had occasion to prepare material critical of a highly praised and publicized invention which in fact turned out to be an empty bubble. Its authors, however, were inventive people indeed for they immediately made the subject classified. Naturally, the newspaper was unable to expose these scientific wheeler-dealers. If one writes a report from the Space Flight Control Center, the space department approves it. If one reports on an oil industry fire, the oil workers approve it. If one talks about a policeman on the take, the MVD approves it. If it's a polluted river, one goes to the State Committee for Hydrometeorology and Environmental Control [Goskomgidromet]. But who wants to sign off on his own slovenliness. Who will hold his own department up to the light for the judgement of millions of people...

[Ugarov] But the situation has changed drastically. Information on accidents and extraordinary events has

been made available, crime statistics are being published, and information on the environmental situation has been disclosed, as have cartography materials and satellite photos.

[Correspondent] I dare say that any reader would be able to continue your list. We all see a significant swing toward openness whenever we open our daily newspapers but I had something else in mind. Even during the period of stagnation, every newspaperman knew that, behind a cloak of spurious secrecy, the departments themselves quite often were concealing their low technical skill levels, lack of management ability, inability to organize things and, at times, openly covering the spots on their suits with the "secret" caveat. But the majority of our readers, both then and perhaps even now, think only the KGB classifies information. Is this the case?

[Ugarov] Of course not. There are different kinds of secrets: military and diplomatic, economic and trade, scientific and technical, and state and departmental secrecy. For this reason, let us define right now the limits of our discussion. We will be talking about that part of the problem which falls within the terms of reference of the USSR KGB, and this part is clear from the name of our subdivision. In short, we will be talking about the protection of state secrets.

The government determines what information constitutes state secrets and it is cited in a listing approved in 1980 by resolution of the USSR Council of Ministers. The list was prepared by a commission of competent specialist from the Ministry of Defense, Gosplan, the State Committee for Science and Technology, the USSR Academy of Sciences, and the KGB, and with the participation of other departments.

[Correspondent] Can any citizen see the list?

[Ugarov] No, the resolution is classified.

[Correspondent] There, you see...

[Ugarov] But there is an unclassified, public document adopted in 1954 and published widely in the press. The 1980 list is not much different. For the most part, it simply provides detail. For example, the 1956 list says that information on new types of weapons is not subject to disclosure. The 1980 list interprets which specific kinds.

The restructuring of political, economic and social life in our country and the fundamental advances in international relations naturally require changes to the system for protecting classified information which is, after all, a child of its time. This system, however, has made an important contribution to the achievement of strategic military parity. The task remains the same: reliably to safeguard classified, and I stress genuinely classified information. In doing this, however, we must create the kind of protection system that can be integrated into our overall restructuring process—not only so it will not interfere with the process, but also to support it. The chairman of the USSR Committee for State Security, V. Kryuchkov, has spoken often about this two-fold and very difficult task in his interviews and speeches and a great deal has been done over the past year and a half to resolve it.

[Correspondent] Are you thinking of the disclosure of information which it does not make sense to classify?

[Ugarov] Yes, this too. Here is an example. Before, satellite photos belonged in the classified category. Now, at the initiative of the USSR Ministry of Defense and the Main Administration of Geodesy and Cartography under the USSR Council of Ministers and with the support of the KGB, they are unclassified. Indeed, why protect in secrecy information available to any country? Our satellites are not the only ones circling the earth after all. The United States, France, and Japan also trade in commercial photographs and now we also have joined the foreign market. Your newspaper has written about this.

[Correspondent] But you entered the market late and this is an example of how spurious secrecy comes back as economic losses. I will cite another example from the very same area. Before, everything related to space was classified, but now the Ministry of General Machinebuilding has prepared an entire catalog of new products which grew out of the creation of the "Energiya" and "Buran" missile and space systems. I hardly need point out the benefits of advanced materials and technology in other branches of the national economy.

[Ugarov] Of course not. But this is a truism: on the one hand, every state has secrets which it must protect, while on the other, unwarranted protection measures interfere with political, economic and social development. I will cite you only one figure. Following a special resolution of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers forcing us to declassify information which it was no longer valid to keep secret, and after the most serious revision of real and questionable secrets, the general volume of information which must be protected from disclosure was reduced significantly—by 35-40 percent in some ministries and departments. In many cases, this revision was done at the initiative of the departments and without our participation of course.

[Correspondent] For all that, if I understand you correctly, the departments classify or, conversely, declassify some kinds of information?

[Ugarov] No, the government introduces changes to the list of the most important state secrets, but they are introduced by the departments. Both the level of secrecy and the effectiveness of declassification of information, the disclosure of which will not harm the country, really depend upon them, the primary link. In the government apparatus, this work goes quickly and constructively. The workers understand well that unnecessary secrecy is a serious impediment to national economic development. But the initiative must come from below, from the departments, and there, alas, it is sometimes lacking. I

am convinced, by the way, that we need not only accountability for disclosure of classified information but also for unwarranted classification. I have been working in this field for 20 years but I cannot recall a single time that someone was punished for this.

[Correspondent] We have already talked about the reasons for this. After building a cart, it is tempting to cloak everything in secrecy and privately report what a beautiful automobile we have built. You must agree that this great work in declassification about which we have been talking has shown all of society just how far behind we are in many areas. What is to keep distortion from appearing again to hide something or another from peoples' eyes. This is not only a matter of the logic of an overcautious person. To many, secrecy is simply advantageous—it allows one to camouflage his own useless, unnecessary work.

[Ugarov] One way to overcome the departmental approach is to develop clear-cut criteria for just what information really belongs in the category of state secrets. This task is extremely complicated and earlier we tried unsuccessfully to deal with it on our own. Now the large forces of the research institutes of the KGB, the MVD, Gosplan, the Ministry of Defense, and the USSR Academy of Sciences have joined together to resolve it. Frankly, we, the Chekists, are happy that our society has realized finally that unwarranted classification costs the state dearly and spares neither strength nor resources for serious scientific work.

[Correspondent] I remind our readers that this task was set forth in the resolution of the 19th Party Conference "On Openness": "to define clearly the limits of necessary official secrecy..." What has been done successfully?

[Ugarov] I repeat that it is very difficult to develop criteria. There are already several rough drafts covering economic and scientific and technical secrets, although there still is no unanimous opinion. For example, protection can depend on the magnitude of the damage which the country would suffer from disclosure of the information. The greater the damage, the higher the level of protection must be. There is another approach, however: evaluate the gain or benefit which disclosure will bring, for, after all, it might turn out to be greater than the damage caused by releasing the information. For military matters or diplomacy there might be other approaches.

I do not want to get ahead of myself but a large collective of investigators is working on this problem. I will point out one thing: management of the country runs on economic rails and protection of information cannot be based on administrative methods. We must look ahead and create a new system under which it will not be advantageous for a department, enterprise, or specific administrator either to classify unnecessarily, or to permit the release of information. I am convinced that the time will come when we will separate state and trade secrets. Right now we do not have this problem for it is directly connected with the nature of property. But look at the sharp debates on this subject which are underway in the USSR Supreme Soviet. For us, the essential nature of protecting trade secrets is unplowed ground—virgin land. At the initiative of the KGB and with the support of the government, research in this sphere has begun. As you see, we have a lot of work ahead of us. In particular, there are many problems with staff preparation and a system for paying them for their labor has not been worked out. There is a paradox here, you see: people working with classified information are paid both as much again as and sometimes less than other people.

[Correspondent] Let us assume that strict, reliable criteria are found. Who will check whether these criteria conform to everyday practices?

[Ugarov] Right now, the departments control preservation of state secrets in there own projects...

[Correspondent] Viktor Aleksandrovich, we all know how valuable that right is to the controller who has it "in his pocket".

[Ugarov] When you are right, you are right; but there is government control, exercised by the Committee for State Security and its organs in place. True, our capabilities lag far behind reality. If we were to control every necessary project, for instance, then there would be a ten or eleven year gap between checks. For this reason, we are forced to check only the most important projects.

Incidentally, control is the sole function in the area of secrecy which normative documents assign to the KGB, but there is historical precedent for the Chekists also to coordinate this work, conduct scientific research, and help organizations and enterprises with their methods. Right now, the boundaries of the scientific work about which we are talking include the preparation of legislative foundations for the protection of classified information. Such a law is absolutely necessary and it must severely limit the functions, authority and responsibilities, both of the state and social organs and of the citizens of our country, in one of the most important areas for any state. Then control will be better organized and there will be less departmental independence.

[Correspondent] I understand that the appeal for a little more openness in secret work sounds paradoxical but, nevertheless, it seems to me that control should be both outside the departments and independent. Formally, the KGB meets these requirements, but what about in practice? You work in some "post box" or another on worthless subjects, receive your pay regularly, and defend your dissertation while hiding behind the "secret" caveat. In short, you "advance" science while you walk a quarter century behind the advanced nations. This while you are working on, for example, powder metallurgy or electrophoresis and there is nothing more important than that. What is important is that a KGB agent hardly can evaluate the necessity for classifying information in all types of work and the caveat of secrecy is often simply a cover.

[Ugarov] We prepare very carefully for a check, knowing how serious the consequences can be both of unnecessary secrecy and of frivolous treatment of real secrets. When there is the slightest doubt, we set up a representative commission and enlist the services of prominent specialists. So by no means do KGB workers play the role of expert on all issues. But we do have the right to conduct any expert examination and this we do quite often, relying first and foremost on the opinions of specialists outside the department.

[Correspondent] I dare say that, just like any citizen, every journalist understands the necessity of protecting genuine state secrets. But quite often, you see, my colleagues run across unclassified documents but they have the "For Official Use Only" caveat. And there you have it! Without access to information, openness is finished. One gets the impression that anyone who wants to can apply this caveat.

[Ugarov] That is not entirely the case, although you are partly right. There is greater opportunity for the unwarranted use of the "For Official Use Only" caveat, the temptation is great, and the level of control is lower than it is with state secrets. But this is not in the terms of reference of the KGB. A department, with the concurrence of USSR Glavlit, prepares the list of classified official information. We do not disregard this area totally, but I would advise you to speak directly with specialists in that institution.

[Correspondent] Thank you for the discussion and I will try to take your advice. It seems we are not finished with this subject.

KGB Press Group on Subversion on Afghan Border

LD0112142589 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1050 GMT 1 Dec 89

[Text] Dushanbe, 1 Dec (TASS)—A permanently operating press-group of the KGB of the Tajik SSR began its activity today with a press conference for local journalists. Vladimir Petkel, chairman of the republic's KGB and a USSR people's deputy, came to the meeting with the journalists. He answered questions about the perestroyka and improvement of the work of Tajikistan's KGB men. He spoke about the activation of operations on the Soviet-Afghan border by the special services of a number of states and by armed formations of the Afghan opposition, with the aim of setting up a base of accomplices to destabilize the situation and undermine the Soviet constitutional system in the Central Asian republics. The KGB men cited specific examples of recruitment, as well as cases uncovered in the course of operation investigative measures, where attempts had been made to import weapons and organize underground activity on the territory of the republic. The journalists were acquainted with a unique exhibition. On display here were confiscated weapons and resources for carrying out terrorist acts and ideological diversion.

The new information service has been set up on the initiative of the state security officials themselves. Its main task is to provide the working people of Tajikistan with objective information about the activity of the republic's KGB bodies. It has been decided to conduct press conferences with journalists on a regular basis. In addition, the members of the KGB press-group are organizing and conducting meetings between officials and labor collectives.

Two Die As Freight Trains Collide Near Murmansk

PM0412152189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Nov 89 Second Edition p 6

[PRAVDA special correspondents A. Khramtsov and V. Chertkov report under the rubric "Emergency": "When the Green Light Shone Bright and Clear"]

[Text] Murmansk—Train traffic along the Olenegorsk-Apatity section resumed yesterday at 0600. It had taken railroad workers 24 hours to restore the line disrupted by the accident and open traffic.

....Freight train No 1611, traveling south from Olenegorsk Station, was supposed to pass through the small station of Rudnyy without stopping. The electric locomotive's engineer A. Plyusnin and his assistant N. Malikov clearly saw the green lights giving them free passage. Suddenly, something unexpected happened. The automatic entrance switch arbitrarily moved the locomotive into a siding where a goods train was standing and waiting for the oncoming train to pass.

Sections of both electric locomotives were destroyed as a result of the crash, 19 cars carrying iron-ore concentrate were derailed, and 6 contact line supports and more than 100 meters of track were destroyed. Engineer A. Plyusnin and his assistant N. Malikov were both killed. Engineer A. Limonov and his assistant Ye. Glazychev from the train standing on the siding were injured and taken to hospital....

As soon as they were informed of the accident, V. Goryachkin, deputy chairman of the Murmansk Oblast Soviet Executive Committee, and V. Dmitrenko, chief of the Murmansk branch of the Oktyabrskaya Railroad, went to the scene of the incident. They headed the operation to clear up and restore the damaged line.

The causes of the accident are being investigated.

Moldavian Communists Discuss 'Acute' Problems

LD0512030289 Moscow TASS in English 1907 GMT 4 Dec 89

[Text] Kishinev December 4 TASS—By TASS correspondent Dmitriy Chubashenko: Most acute problems of Moldavia's social and political development and specific measures for the consolidation of all public forces for their solution were discussed by a meeting of activists of the republican party organisation here today.

Speakers noted that despite every effort, the situation in the republic remains tense. Its instability and explosiveness give rise to concern and impart elements of destabilisation to perestroyka processes.

It was also noted that there is a need for a flexible tactic of the party's effect on the processes of renewal in the republic. There is a need for persistent, patient work in every direction to change radically a complex social and political situation characterised by the confrontation of various public forces, division of people according to the nationality.

Petr Luchinsky, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Moldavian Communist Party, noted specifically that it is necessary to take into consideration constructive aspects in the opponents' stance and determine areas for the application of efforts of every one and pooling these efforts.

It has been possible to ease tension in the republic in the recent weeks, it was said at the meeting. But this is just the beginning. "Recriminations should be stopped. We should look together for ways to future," it was said at the meeting, and these words called forth applause.

Former Trade Minister Patolichev Dies

LD0512021289 Moscow TASS in English 1456 GMT 4 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 4 TASS—Former Foreign Trade Minister Nikolay Patolichev has died at the age of 81, it was officially announced here today.

An obituary, signed by party and state leaders, said that Patolichev worked his way up from factory worker to senior official.

He began a party career in 1938, serving as first secretary of the Yaroslavl, Chelyabinsk and Rostov Regional Party Committees, secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party's Central Committee, first secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party's Central Committee, head of a department and secretary of the Soviet Communist Party's Central Committee.

In 1956-1958, Patolichev was deputy and then first deputy foreign minister of the USSR.

From 1958 until his retirement on pension in 1985 Patolichev was foreign trade minister of the USSR.

Economic

Statistical Yearbook for 1988 Economy Published

LD2011182989 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1105 GMT 20 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, 29 Nov (TASS)—The statistical yearbook "National Economy of the USSR in 1988" has come off the press. It gives the basic results of the social and economic development of the USSR for 1988. For most of the indices comparisons are made with 1986 and 1987 and with the previous 5-year-plan periods.

Information on the development of the social sphere, in particular on the income of the population, and court statistics has been expanded. The results of a number of items of sociological research and on-off polls are given.

The preliminary results of the all-union census are reflected.

For some indices international comparisons are given.

Ecology Committee's Draft Law on Property

904A0080A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 21 Nov 89 Second Edition p 1

[Draft USSR Law On Property in the USSR, drawn up by the Committee of the USSR Supreme Soviet on Matters of the Ecology and Efficient Use of Natural Resources]

[Text]

Section I. General Provisions Article 1. Property and Right of Ownership in the USSR

1. Property in the USSR is the appropriation by citizens of the conditions and results of productive activity, with the aim of satisfying individual, collective, and social needs. Property in the USSR exists as:

a) state—all-union, republic, municipal (belonging to local soviets);
b) collective—cooperative, corporative, joint-stock, and property of social and religious organizations;
c) individual—personal and private;
d) mixed forms of ownership.

Article 2. Objects of Ownership

Objects of ownership include:
land, depths of the earth, flora, fauna, airspace, natural riches of the continental shelf;
natural and ethnic landscapes and objects, objects of material and spiritual culture;
means of production and information media;
monetary instruments and securities;
products of intellectual and creative activity;
all varieties of labor.

Article 3. Subjects of the Right of Ownership

Subjects of the right of ownership include:
Soviet and foreign citizens;
collectives producing material and intellectual output, their associations, social and religious organizations, other citizen associations;
soviets of people's deputies at all levels, in the form of their authorized organs.

Article 4. Competence of the Owner

The authorized owner (subject of the right of ownership) has the rights of possession, disposition, and use of the

object of ownership. Rights of possession, disposition, and use are regulated by USSR law.

Article 5. Forms of Ownership

The USSR socio-economic system is founded on pluralism of forms of ownership, to include state, collective, individual, and mixed forms of ownership.

All forms of ownership in the USSR are acknowledged as having equal rights, precluding a monopoly by any of them.

Competition among all forms of ownership creates the conditions for realization of social justice.

Article 6. Rights and Obligations of the Owner

The right of ownership in the USSR is acknowledged and protected by law. Property can not be alienated from its owner without his will, except by court order.

The owner is obliged to provide for the correct and safe maintenance of the property belonging to him, and for its efficient use, not to the detriment of society or the surrounding environment.

Section II. Structure of Forms of Ownership

State Property

Article 7. **State property** includes all-union, republic, and municipal property.

Article 8. **All-union property** is property of the federated Soviet state, the USSR. It includes territorial waters and the marine shelf, strategic entities of overall state significance, and other entities acknowledged to be all-union property with the consent of the union republics.

Article 9. Property of Union and Autonomous Republics

The property of union and autonomous republics is comprised of the property of the socialist states (SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] and ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic]) which form the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, as well as other entities so acknowledged, with the consent of the peoples inhabiting the applicable republics.

Article 10. Municipal Property

Municipal property includes the property of village, settlement, rayon, city, oblast, and kray councils of people's deputies, national and national-territorial okrugs and oblasts, other national-territorial formations.

Collective Property

Article 11. **Collective property** includes cooperative, corporative, and joint-stock property, as well as the property of social and religious organizations.

Article 12. Cooperative Property

Cooperative property is the general property of citizens who have united voluntarily on a membership basis, for the joint conduct of economic and other activity.

Article 13. Corporative Property

The property of labor collectives of enterprises and associations (unions, firms), formed as a result of gratuitous transfer or purchase from the state or another owner, is corporate and joint, and is replenished by income. The entire labor collective—and not just its representative organ—is the subject of the right of corporative ownership.

Article 14. Joint-Stock Property

Joint-stock property arises when an enterprise issues stock for the entire value of its production assets (statutory assets) minus the individual shares of members of the labor collective.

Article 15. Property of Social and Religious Organizations

Property of social and religious organizations is formed through voluntary fees and donations of members, and of individual citizens, enterprises, associations, and other contributors; it is used in accordance with the statutes or regulations of these organizations.

Individual Property

Article 16. Individual Property

Individual property of citizens comprises the basis of satisfying their material and spiritual needs and includes everyday objects, household articles, personal-use and comfort items, housing, financial savings, auxiliary housekeeping items, products individually made.

Article 17. Private Property

Private property entails individual ownership of means of social production with the possibility of alienation and the right of inheritance. Income from the use of private property is regulated by USSR legislation on taxation.

Mixed Ownership

Article 18. **Mixed forms of ownership arise** through the union of capital and material objects of all forms of ownership recognized by law. Control of mixed forms of ownership is effected both by apportionment principles and by even distribution of income among the proprietary parties who have joined their capital together by agreement. The share or participation in a mixed form of ownership can be alienated or not alienated, depending on the participating subject.

Section III.

Land Ownership in the USSR

Article 19. Right of Possession of Land

Land in the USSR can be the property of soviets of people's deputies at all levels, of state and collective enterprises, social and religious organizations, or private individuals. The scope of private land ownership is regulated by the USSR Law on Land, according to which the land can be leased, sold, or passed on by inheritance.

Deputy Minister Explains Export Licenses

PM0412145189 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 16 Nov 89 First Edition p 3

[Interview with V.I. Vorontsov, USSR first deputy minister of foreign economic relations, by Yu. Subbotin: "Deal Under License. USSR First Deputy Foreign Economic Relations Minister V.I. Vorontsov Reflects on Problems of Independence in International Trade"; date, place not given]

[Text] [Subbotin] Vsevolod Ivanovich, the press has recently been vigorously debating USSR Council of Ministers Resolution No 203 of 7 March 1989 "On Measures for State Regulation of Foreign Economic Activity." What occasioned the need to adopt it?

[Vorontsov] The government resolution in question was adopted in order to ensure that the economic independence of participants in foreign economic activity is efficiently combined with its state regulation. It is an entire package of measures and regulations encouraging, on the one hand, certain types and areas of such activity (for example, the go-ahead has been given for exports of machinery and technical products and other finished output) and regulating, on the other, access to the foreign market for commodities of statewide significance, including nonrenewable and scarce natural resources, food, metals, cement, mineral fertilizers, and scientific and technical developments.

Unfortunately, certain economic leaders have perceived the granting of the right to independently carry out foreign economic activity on the basis of the principles of hard currency cost recovery as permission to earn foreign currency by any ways and means.

Many enterprises, organizations, and cooperatives still lack experience of commercial work in the foreign market. And so unsubstantiated concessions have frequently been made to foreign businessmen in relation to the key conditions of a commercial deal which largely determine future financial results. The reason for this has mainly been ignorance of the actual state of affairs on the world market, but sometimes it has been excessive haste without carrying out the necessary precontract study of questions (specifying the existing prices for the commodity, delivery and payment terms, the partner's reliability, and so forth).

The most typical instances of violations of state interests recently have been the uncoordinated emergence on the foreign market of a number of Soviet suppliers with the very same export commodities, the making of deals without regard for reliable information on market conditions, on price movement trends, or on the state of the Soviet Union's balance of trade and payments with individual countries, and also the sale of commodities at understated prices and the purchase of imported products at unjustifiably high prices.

Thus, for example, the Complete Metal Structures Plant (Pervouralsk City) sold on barter terms a roll-formed angle (ferrous metals) at a price half the prices at which this commodity was previously sold in large quantities. At the same time prices for purchased imported goods—namely, down-filled jackets and tape cassettes—were set 2-3 times higher than the prices for analogous products imported through specialized foreign economic organizations. The Far East Plant named for the USSR's 50th anniversary (Vladivostok City) sold 25 tonnes of bronze billets to the PRC within the framework of border trade, and the cost of the consignment was set 2.4 times below that at which other Soviet exporters sell their analogous products abroad, using the proceeds to make purchases there.

The USSR Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations does not control contract prices directly—and is not in a position to do so—but controls them through the data-processing system (by way of the "InformVES" Association, the All-Union Scientific Research Market Conditions Institute, and foreign economic associations), and when interested organizations request advice and assistance in calculating prices, the ministry's subdepartments make the necessary recommendations.

In seeking to sell goods abroad at any price under conditions of very tough competition, certain Soviet organizations, enterprises, and cooperatives not only forgo some income but also risk incurring great unpleasantnesses and harming the state. The point is that such deals sometimes lead to a charge of unscrupulous competition and dumping. And in this case the guilty parties themselves are subject to sanctions (an additional high duty is levied on their goods) and, most importantly, this may result in a high duty being imposed for a lengthy period on the same commodity supplied from the USSR by other exporters.

[Subbotin] The resolution speaks of licenses for the right to export and import a number of goods, services, and raw materials. In individual cases this measure appears topical and justified, for example when it is a question of oil, gas, ore, coal, precious metals, and foodstuffs. However, does the introduction of licensing not mean a strengthening of the monopoly role of departments and ministries granted the right to issue licenses?

[Vorontsov] The purpose of licensing is to regulate foreign trade, not to prohibit it. Permission is granted in the form of licenses, and this means that a deal is kept under control in the interests of the state. At the Congress of People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet session there were criticisms of the licensing system. Some people, particularly individual participants in

border trade and barter operations, regard it as a bureaucratic, administrative lever which "crushes" initiative in the development of foreign economic ties. In our view, this reveals a manifest failure to understand the essence of the matter. The licensing system is a widespread element for the regulation of international trade used in practice in many countries. It protects national interests and is implemented, as a rule, by a single state organ.

State organs to which the government has given the right to implement licensing must ensure the linkage of exports with production programs, as well as with import requirements with regard to corresponding goods, guided here by the interests of the state as a whole.

In addition to the USSR Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations, the right to issue export-import licenses has been granted to certain all-union ministries and departments and also to union republic councils of ministers and a number of public organizations.

Thus, the Foreign Economic Relations Ministry was responsible for 2,210 of the 3,570 licenses issued to participants in foreign economic activity by the beginning of October 1989, or approximately 60 percent.

Let us recall that some control over the movement of foreign trade freight was exercised previously too. Thus, prior to 1 April 1989 the USSR Foreign Economic Relations Ministry and, before that, the Foreign Trade Ministry and the State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations used to give permission, in accordance with the regulations that existed, for the export and import of 15,000 types of goods across the border. At present only approximately 3,000 types of goods are licensed.

[Subbotin] What is the procedure for obtaining licenses?

[Vorontsov] In order to obtain a license a Soviet participant in foreign economic activity submits an application in the form laid down by the "Statute on the Procedure for Licensing Operations in USSR Foreign Economic Ties" approved by the USSR Council of Ministers State Foreign Economic Commission 20 March 1989. The statute and the instruction on filling out licenses were published in 1989 in the journal VNESHNYAYA TORGOVLYA Nos 3 and 4, the USSR Foreign Economic Relations Ministry's BYULLETEN INOSTRANNOY KOMMERCHESKOY INFORMATSII Nos 34, 35, 36, and 39, and in EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA No 13. A brief account of the documents was published at the end of March this year in the majority of central newspapers.

Licenses are issued to those participants in foreign economic ties who have been registered and entered in the State Register. The procedure for registering corporate bodies embarking on work in foreign markets was also announced in the central and local press and in the said specialized publications. More than 9,000 participants in foreign economic operations have now been registered.

Decisions to issue licenses are made by organs and organizations empowered to do so not later than 30 days after the application is received. A payment of R50 is levied for the issue of licenses.

However, this is in no way an indirect tax, as individual newspaper articles have interpreted this payment, but a sum levied by economically accountable organizations which carry out all operations of issuing licenses and incur certain costs in this connection. This money goes to defray the cost of forming a data bank, leasing modern computers and communications channels, and developing software and to cover other costs associated with the issuing of licenses.

Licenses which have been issued cannot be transferred to other corporate bodies. For example, permission to export production waste cannot be realized through an intermediary who is not permitted to undertake such operations.

In order to better organize work on issuing licenses for export-import operations and registering participants in foreign economic ties and to bring these operations as close as possible to the client, the network of USSR Foreign Economic Relations Ministry representatives has been extended by establishing new administrations in the major economic regions of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic.

[Subbotin] Why are intermediary trade relations conducted only in a centralized manner?

[Vorontsov] Intermediary services in the foreign economic sphere of activity are mainly provided by specialized foreign economic organizations. These are the all-union foreign economic associations of sectoral ministries and departments of union subordination, associations of the USSR Foreign Economic Relations Ministry and the USSR Chamber of Trade and Industry, republic foreign economic associations, and a number of other organizations.

Production cooperatives and their unions (associations) may export only output independently produced by them, work, and services. They do not have the right to buy up goods with a view to reselling them for export or to act as an intermediary in foreign economic operations as a form of activity.

The point is that, by buying up goods (services) in the country and reselling them abroad, cooperatives have retained all currency proceeds, while the state foreign economic organizations conducting intermediary operations on the basis of a commission contract hand over practically all currency proceeds to the state. In a number of cases intermediary activity by cooperatives has resulted in their getting "superincomes."

At the same time joint ventures are permitted to carry out intermediary deals concluded for the purpose of supporting their basic activity. In this case it is necessary

to obtain a license for each intermediary deal from the Foreign Economic Relations Ministry.

[Subbotin] For what period of time is licensing being introduced?

[Vorontsov] In accordance with the government resolution, the licensing of goods of statewide significance has been introduced in its present form for 1989-1990. The licensing of exporting and importing as an instrument for controlling trade flows is just one lever in the state regulation of foreign economic ties. Tariff regulation is a more effective economic lever. The present customs tariff does not fully reflect the country's general economic priorities and has an inadequately developed range of goods. The introduction of a new customs tariff as of 1 January 1991, which is now being drawn up in accordance with a USSR Council of Ministers decision, will make it possible to actively influence the country's trade policy. It will be based on a harmonized system of coding and describing goods widely used in international practice. Therefore we cannot say that licensing will always exist as an administrative measure.

The GATT countries, incidentally, officially recognize licensing as a measure of a temporary nature. But in practice only the "set" of licensed goods, deals, and countries is changed. It is determined by the current needs of the country's economic development and is very mobile. For example, a strained situation has taken shape in the USSR's mutual transactions with the SFRY, Finland, and the DPRK, and the state is obliged to take effective measures to rectify the situation. This has been done by introducing licensing of imports of goods and services from the first two countries and exports to the DPRK. For the same reasons temporary licensing of imports from Egypt is also being introduced now.

Thus, the licensing system that exists today is not ossified. It will improve with due regard for the state of mutual trade with individual countries and an analysis of the practice of applying licensing.

Readers Debate Merits of Private Ownership

PM0112135389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 2

[IZVESTIYA letters department editor Yu. Orlik review: "Private Ownership: For and Against"]

[Text] "Everywhere there are calls for the restoration of capitalist relations in the economy and an attempt is being made on the life of ownership by all the people, yet we are keeping quiet" (V. Shchekin, worker, Astrakhan). "How cleverly political worker and USSR People's Deputy Lieutenant Colonel N. Petrushenko in fact expressed himself at the session of the Supreme Soviet: 'Those who are suggesting private ownership I want to call not comrades but Mr deputies'" (S. Bryantsev, Gomel). "I am ready to join armed formations as a volunteer to take part in a civil war against the restorers of private ownership" (E. Barsov, chief of the Pskov Oblast Voluntary Society for the Promotion of the Army, Aviation, and Navy shooting club).

That is how readers are reacting to the debates in parliament. It is to the debates and not the actual draft law on ownership, published recently. It is to be supposed that responses to it are still on their way to the editorial office. This stipulation is necessary because the letters sometimes speak about something which is not in the law and has not entered into it. Nor, incidentally, has the concept of private ownership entered into it.

When you read letters like those cited above the idea of the inadequacy of responses arises. Surely it is not a case of eliminating state ownership, of handing over nationwide property to private owners? Surely they do not want to take something from the people? On the contrary—they want to give, to return what was estranged, what was arrogated by the administrative-edict system or rather by its apparatus.

The defenders of a single and undivided ownership could be understood if we had lived in clover under it. But no! In that case, what is making them so obstinate? "Most unfortunately, dame dogma sits tight in our country," engineer Ye. Belyayev from Leningrad notes in this connection. "Any innovation can be rejected by quotations from Marx and Lenin. But is everything which Marx justified 150 years ago undisputed and applicable to our modern life, especially its socialist formation, which he merely groped for with the tip of his thoughts and his pen? Why is it that we are persistently reluctant to borrow the most important thing from Lenin's creative legacy—constant development, movement, quest, departure (sometimes a very drastic departure) from former ideas which have proven to be wrong and have not been confirmed in practice?"

Dogmatic thinking and the reluctance to concede principles despite reality are not our fault, but our misfortune. That is how we were brought up. "We are all the children of ownership by all the people," G. Tverdokhlebov, a worker at the Volga Truck Plant from Tolyatti, aptly notes. Indeed, the concept of "state" and "private" in our awareness have been separated by the greatest possible distance. They belonged to different social galaxies—ours and theirs. State was synonymous with good, private instilled suspicion and called for political vigilance.

It is all the more gratifying to note the change in views on the problems of ownership which have taken place in literally the past six months. I well remember the reaction generated by Chingiz Aytmatov's speech at the first congress of USSR People's Deputies, where he allowed himself to compare Swedish socialism with ours to the detriment of the latter. Thunder and lightening descended upon the writer's head. Today readers themselves are trying to draw this comparison and are analyzing the structure of forms of ownership in Western countries, the principles of social policy, and the place of private enterprise in the economy. A characteristic

admission: "Only a year ago, as a party member, I categorically opposed private ownership as incompatible with socialism," V. Stolyarov from Yaroslavl writes. "But by attentively heeding the parliamentary debates and analyzing statements in the press, I concluded I was wrong...."

What do the opponents of the destratitification of ownership say, what are their arguments? "The lease, the contract, and the cooperative movement stratify society into poor and rich," states S. Vyatkin, a working pensioner from Moscow. "This social stratification and, if you like, social polarization, can lead to serious contradictions and conflicts," warns Captain 2d class R. Avanesov (retired) from Sevastopol. These fears should not be rejected out of hand. The destruction of the monolith of ownership and the appearance in this connection of numerous new forms of economic activity will undoubtedly affect income level and the prosperity of different strata and groups of the population. The social defense of the badly off is a very acute problem. "But we must not think that the poor are poor because there are rich people in society," Ye. Afanasyev from Chudovo City, Novgorod Oblast, reasonably remarks. But the point is that the very idea that some people will live differently, more affluently, seems blasphemous to our consciousness educated in the idea of a sharing out which equalizes everyone.

"You remember Sharikov from Bulgakov's 'Heart of a Dog?'" Writes V. Brunko, a captain at the Novosibirsk river port. "He resolved all complexities thus: 'Take everything and share it out.' Unfortunately, we have always had plenty of Sharikovs. We have taken and shared out the property of the strong, thrifty peasants—and what was the result? Now they are suggesting that we take the 'excess money' from its owners and some trade union leaders are particularly zealous in kindling such sentiments. Sharikov's methods can only worsen the situation and sow panic: 'They will behave like rich peasants!'"

R. Bogdanovich, CPSU member since 1940, from Lida City, Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, sets forth in more detail his fears as to where the orientation toward private ownership could lead (although it is not a case of orientation toward one type of ownership, but of the existence of different forms of ownership on the basis of equal rights and competition): "For a start we should define our aim: What kind of society do we want to build—socialism or modernized capitalism? That path is obviously not ruled out," he writes. "If that is indeed the case it must be noted with regret that the October revolution was a mistake and agree with the malicious joke that socialism is the longest path to capitalism. Then we need not complicate matters but simply follow Churchill's advice when, criticizing our State Planning Committee, he said: Open your borders to international capital and you will have everything from needles to steamships.... Our economic thinking's list toward commodity-market relations is obvious. Everyone is relying on it as a panacea for all our ailments. But here they forget that the inevitable concomitants of this system are competition, bankruptcy, and unemployment." S. Mungalov from Karaganda writes about the same thing: "With a view to economic recovery our new fighters for the people's prosperity from the ranks of the deputies are calling on the supreme authorities to widely introduce cooperatives, individual farms, joint stock companies, and a free market.... and are calling on people to stand under banners on which are printed the words: 'Backward to capitalism!' But they cannot fail to know that a capitalist, however you may embellish him, is still, without the exploitation of the working people, a carter without a horse...."

Of course, following Ye. Yakimov from Andizhan we may say in response to this: "Enough of frightening us with capitalism!" We may think about "the next banal example" cited in his letter by L. Alshits from Baranovichi City: "There are two forms: The family form and the kolkhoz form. On the former, weight gains and milk yields are invariably higher. But how? Have they taken on more people? No, there are fewer than there were. Additional capital investments? None of them either. So how was the increase achieved? By the farm becoming the farmer's own.... The conclusion is that we have already experimented with nonprivate ownership so why not try it from the other end?"

Ye. Afanasyev from Novgorod Oblast is also convinced of the need for "more viable forms of ownership." "Everyone knows that our economy is choking in the clutches of thriftlessness," he writes. "According to some estimates the annual losses from this total R600 billion. The conjectured sum is so enormous that there is nothing to compare it with except the direct material damage in the Great Patriotic War—R679 billion. Surely a state in a state of war cannot at the same time effectively resolve social problems?" Abd then the author writes: "But what is thriftlessness [beskhozyaystvennost]? That word means: without a master [bez khozyayina]. The state cannot be the master of the means of production. State ownership is dead. Belonging to the state means belonging to nobody."

I do not know about anyone else but this argument convinces me.

Finally, one more serious warning connected with the possible political consequences of the development of private ownership. "It is perfectly natural to suppose," Ye. Fedorin from Ufa writes, "that private owners will try to create a political organization and get their candidates through to the supreme legislative organ...." You cannot deny the logic of these arguments. A varied economy will inevitably also make itself felt in the superstructure, in the political sphere. But why is this idea of itself presented as seditious—even in the historical term? "Of course, we should not expect any miracles in the Japanese style from a mere recognition of the multiplicity and equality of forms of ownership," writes V. Bedrin, a scientific staffer from Moscow. "But it does not seem unrealistic in the foreseeable future to achieve

a level close to the socialist countries of Europe where, incidentally, there is the multiparty system and parliamentary factions which so frighten many people...."

Let's get together to rid ourselves of yesterday's dogmas and passions. Including embarking on the discussion of the draft law on ownership.

Food Product Quality Worsens, Prices Rise

904D0028A Moscow TRUD in Russian 22 Nov 89 p 2

[Article by V. Karpov: "Deception. Why the USSR Gosstandart Puts Up With Poor-Quality Products"]

[Text] Today we shall speak not about the counters that are empty but about those that still have goods on them. We hope that we shall not have to pay too much: For state trade is not private business. It will not deceive us.

Let us take the most consumed product—bread. Commodity No 1. Here it would seem that everything is apparent. But... About 4 years ago "in order to improve the quality of bakery items and improve the material incentives for labor collectives to produce them," it was decreed that new grades of loaves and baguettes be produced. This time concern for the consumer ended up in a significant increase in prices. If the "Orlovskiy" bread, for example, cost 18 kopecks, the new kind, "Rossiyskiy" that was supposed to replace it cost 24. The "Stolichnyy" cost 2 more kopecks than the "Stolovoy"... But this chicken feed when it is translated into the annual consumption becomes hard-earned money for those who do not have much.

But ultimately one could accept such a turn of events if the concern for quality had been authentic. But there seem to be some doubts about this.

Let us begin with the fact that the standard for new strains of grain has become advantageous for the producer and not the consumer. The standard has opened up a number of loopholes for slipshod work. In the case of "Rossiyskiy" bread, for example, they dropped the requirement for the percentage ratio for flour of the first and second grades, which made it possible for bakeries to select the recipe at their own discretion when doing the baking. The requirement that the bread must be brown on top has disappeared. Speaking in the language of the consumer, it is as though hack work had been legitimized.

After this can one be surprised that the "miracle bread" goes stale quickly, crumbles, and has lost its previous aroma, texture, and taste. Compare: In England, for example, bread is sold in small bakeries in bakers' shops—up to 35 kinds are produced right there before the eyes of the consumer. Toward the end of the day the left over goods are taken away and marked down, so that, God forbid, the customer will not buy yesterday's bread.

One must say that our domestic bread baking industry, even after it had dipped into the consumer's pocket, gained nothing from it. It is easy to become convinced of this by visiting practically any bakery. Just as before one sees manual labor, a shortage of personnel, and dirty premises. The unearned money increase might even have aggravated the chronic diseases of the branch. Thus the "relaxed" standards are ignored everywhere. For example, at bakery No 8 in the capital during one of the inspections they refused to let 80 percent of the products be sold! Of course the leaders of the enterprise were penalized. But inspections do not occur every day, and we cannot count on the meticulousness and captiousness of the inspectors. And really what good does it do us that a negligent director was fined?! It would be more logical if the commodity were not up to standard but were edible to reduce its price. It seems to me that it would be even more honest finally to muster our courage and return to producing the previous kinds of bread in full volume. And if it were necessary to raise the prices for it, then we should honestly explain to the people what the extra money is for, how much, and why. And we must prove that this is necessary.

But if we look at the problem from a purely economic standpoint, we are forced to conclude that the enterprises must have real independence. So that crumbs will not be tossed down to them from above but rather they will earn their own money. Especially in the competitive struggle. Then the attitude toward the work and the authority of the "firm" would undoubtedly change.

The V. Zotov bakery, the oldest in the capital, will soon be 60 years old. Today the enterprise is on the verge of collapse: There are neither spare parts nor equipment—and a heap of unsolved social problems. But things could be different if 13-15 percent of the profit were left for the collective (even if the enterprise were working in the new way, with self-financing). Now, for instance, the cooperative "Zefir," having leased the bakery and shop which were operating at a loss, in 2 years has brought the income up to more than R100,000. The wages here are better and people are standing in line to get the bread. But what is natural for an economy that is oriented toward the demands of the consumer is completely absurd for an economic mechanism that has not yet been pushed from its pedestal, when these demands are made to conform to some given "production" factor...at practically all levels.

In 1987 in response to numerous complaints from the population about the poor quality of bread a government decree was adopted which categorically ordered: To prohibit any kind of deviation from the standards. The USSR Council of Ministers assumed the role of the long-awaited defender of the rank-and-file consumer for departmental arbitrariness. But the ban did not last for very long. Just a year later in the next decree the enterprises were given an almost unlimited right to depart from the GOST's [All-Union State Standards] for grain, flower, buckwheat groats, millet.... And the departments were given even more allowances than ever before. While previously the USSR Gosstandart [State Standard] had something like a monopoly on the regulation of technological norms and rules, now it is simply

given an instruction as to which rules to relax for whom and for what. The role of the standards committee has been reduced to distributing excerpts from the decrees.

But the story of bread is only a stroke (true, an extremely typical one) in the picture of almost total deception. A landslide of ersatz goods is falling down on us constantly and it has been for many years. At the same price as the real goods and with the same labels.

In 1982, as we are told by the correspondent from the press center of the Belorussian consumers' society, I. Filipenko, the republic began to produce "Yuzhnaya" cooked sausage. Last year a new standard was established for its analog—"Zaslavskaya" sausage. The product is much worse: Not first-grade but second-grade beef and meat scraps are used in it. The price of the "imitation" is the same.

If we had discovered a salesman cheating in the market, naturally, we would be terribly upset and probably would not go back to this hawker again. But with state distribution and a shortage of products our selection is extremely limited. And as a rule the consumer does not have reliable information. Who can know that in the "Stolovaya" sausage the meat has been replaced with filler or, more simply, bouillon in which bones have been cooked. Gosstandard, of course, is abreast of this since it is the one that gave the permission to produce the surrogate. And we are playing the role we have been assigned of extras in the little bureaucratic games.

Bread, sausage.... On this same "black" list of ersatz goods one can include eggs, macaroni, poultry, meat, canned goods.... Each year hundreds and hundreds of products that are "not quite right" appear on the counters of the stores. Who knows what is being changed in the food recipes behind our backs?! Quite recently, for example, there appeared in the stores cottage cheese which contained more liquid and less fat. Cutlets and briskets prepared in deviation from the norm have been offered to the consumers. Permission has been granted to sell several batches of tea from the Moscow tea distribution factory where the norms were also violated. Last year the USSR Gosstandart, with V. Sychev in charge, allowed departures from the GOST's for potatoes, carrots, cabbage, tomatoes... Taking into account the "unfavorable weather conditions" the Krasnodar agroindustrial complex was given the right to produce canned goods for children's nutrition (and they were given to the youngsters!) with "relaxed" norms.

Even drinking water has not been left out. I shall quote this document: "The USSR Gosstandart has considered the request of the Ulyanovsk Oblispolkom [oblast executive committee] to provide the population with drinking water with indicators of taste, cloudiness, and concentrations of residual chlorine and aluminum that do not meet the requirements of GOST 2874-82... nonstandard drinking water." The same "exceptions" were made for residents of the cities of Kuznetsk, Saransk, Insary, Chapayevsk... Also supposedly for a short period of time.

But what is proposed as a temporary measure lasts, as a rule, for years. I do not know if there are any products left that have not been affected by the mildew of the surrogate.

But now this question arises: Not a single one of the resolutions, documents, or decisions untying the hands of the producers has mentioned that the consumer should be given as compensation the opportunity to buy the ersatz product at its real price and not at the one set for the good original. At best the wholesale price is reduced for unusable, semi-usable, or long-unsold goods. But what do we, the consumers get from this?

True, let us be objective, there are still the instructions of the USSR State Committee for Prices (they are concealed in the note in the finest print that is attached to the additional list of retail prices for bread) where it is stipulated that products that deviate from the standards must be sold at a rebate of 20 percent of the retail prices. That is a noble but, alas, empty wish.

"Can you find," says the leader of the work group of the correspondence buyers club of the AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions], A. Kannabikh, "an example in which the prices have been reduced, even by a kopeck? Hardly, although people have written many times about the quality of bread. But why? Because they 'forgot' to develop a mechanism for reducing prices or even to inform the collectives in the bakery shops of the new price list with the note."

Actually, prices for food products have increased without any discussion or declaration of reforms. And their quality has deteriorated. And if you have occasion to hear that we have begun to consume more of certain food products, I recommend that you take such an assertion with a grain of salt. Because behind the names "meat," "sausage," and "poultry" they might be concealing something that is only similar to these food products.

Of course, the situation in the country is not simple. There is not enough capital, the crops perishing in the grip of bad weather and mismanagement. It is necessary to look for compromises, to save, to economize, and to look for various ways of producing products. According to the principle: Let it be not as good as long as there is more. Do not leave the store shelves entirely bare. But then we must honestly explain to the population which products have deviations and what has been taken out and what has been put in. Suffice it to post an announcement that describes the good at the entrance to the store or next to the counter and indicate its quality on the label. How long can the consumer play the role of the deceived and robbed? But we have not yet learned to tell the truth, without which real production and trade are unthinkable in principle. And yet the practice of the

production and sale of ersatz goods is bad also because it is fraught with conflicts and contains the threat of mass poisoning.

So perhaps in the age of glasnost, taking into account the fact that common sense is beginning to prevail in life, we can reject one of the main traditions of the age of stagnation when the consumer was the outcast of the society. We all must understand that we cannot achieve success through deception, juggling of figures, cheating, and showing a complete lack of respect for one another. The drive for immediate gain is immoral. It is impossible to achieve a good condition of the state through deception of the consumer, that is, all the people.

Hasty Dismantling of Central Control Criticized

904A0067A Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 10 Nov 89 p 1

[First installment of two-part article by Soltan Dzarasov: "Reform: Reality and Prospects"]

[Text] **Reform has truly become an hour of triumph for our scientists-economists. Today they have an opportunity not only to propose ideas, but also to put them into practice. The attention of both the government and society is riveted on their ideas and theories. We will mention at least the last two meetings of economists that were held in the CPSU Central Committee. One more major conference lies ahead. The All-Union Scientific Practical Conference on Problems of Radical Economic Reform will convene in Moscow in November.**

Today we will acquaint the reader with the point of view on these problems of the prominent scholar Soltan Dzarasov.

I fear that the bountiful stream of superficial articles and other statements that demand an immediate shift to a convertible ruble are directly connected with the failures of economic reform. Losing patience and confidence, the people are turning to one and then to another, as it seems to them, saving remedy.

There is no question that the convertibility of the ruble is a condition for the transition to a market economy and that we actually need it. But need is one thing and opportunity is another. We must have the courage to see reality for what it is. The specific features and the structure of the economy on the whole, and the results of economic reform in particular, are the reasons why an immediate transition to convertibility is impossible. It cannot be carried out as a clever trick. It requires the development of a transition convertibility program that is detailed and that would ensue from the progress of economic reform. Of course, it should not be postponed for long, but haste and insufficient thought are also fraught with serious consequences. A convertible ruble can be approached gradually as the transition is made from an isolated and centrally planned economy to a free market.

Unfortunately the necessity for a transition from one qualitative condition to another was not perceived by us during the preparation and implementation of economic reform. An impartial analysis of the harsh realities of our life, their sober assessment, and the methods of difficult resolutions in the usual manner were replaced by myths that were pleasing to the ear.

For example, where did the formula for acceleration come from? In any case, not from an analysis of reality. From the very beginning it had an emotional coloration. It is not surprising that the result turned out differently. The rates of economic growth for the 4 years of perestroyka are lower than for the previous 4 years.

The declared independence did not give the expected results. The rates of growth fell even more than in the time of stagnation, and inflation was transformed from crawling to galloping, the budget deficit jumped fantastically, and the consumer market became unbalanced.

The situation did not improve after the June (1987) Plenum of the Central Committee on economic reform. The adopted decisions were uncoordinated, and they did not envisage programs for raising the consumer purchasing power of the ruble and ensuring its convertibility. However, even that which was planned did not have the necessary basis. Otherwise, how does one explain the confidence that in 2-3 years we will implement radical reform in the economy and achieve substantially positive results?

Undoubtedly we had no choice other than perestroyka and economic reform. But the problems that arise from them should not be hushed up either.

First of all, the question comes up as to why reform not only did not overcome inflation and the deficit, but, to the contrary, aggravated them. Because, I think, it did not have a sufficiently scientific guarantee. It was erected from the very beginning on a false premise, as if our economy was a commodity or a market economy. The conclusion was reached from this that all it took was to expand the rights of enterprises and introduce full economic accountability and self-financing, and the collectives and their managers would begin to display initiative and enterprise.

I was not the creator of the initiatives that had negative consequences. Moreover, I even objected to some of them which, however, did not produce any results. But I shared a number of errors on the basis of which incorrect decisions were made, and the sooner we rethink these and revise them the better.

As a result of long years of arguments about the role of commodity-monetary relationships in our society, as happened frequently even earlier, we threw out the baby with the bath water. Carried away by the criticism of those who "underestimated" the role of these relationships, we did not notice that there was a valuable kernel of truth in their judgments. Opponents, the so-called "anti-market proponents" [antitovarnik] viewed our

socioeconomic structure not as a commodity system, but as a systematically organized economy with its inherent mechanism of centralized control to which the block of commodity-monetary relationships were subordinate. Believing the creation of such a system to be our greatest achievement, they indicated that the methods for its introduction cannot be changed arbitrarily, shifting the center of gravity from the whole to a part, from the axis of centralism to an individual section: The ship might capsize because of this.

We, the "market proponents" [tovarnik] reproached our opponents with an authoritarian understanding of centralism, which would lead to bureaucracy, shackle creative initiative, engender irresponsibility, and psychological dependency. Without the necessary development of commodity-monetary relationships and their active use, we said, it is impossible to develop initiative, create the necessary interest in work, and manage an economy efficiently. Were we right in this? I think, yes. But we did not take into account that the system for managing an economy, which we previously endearingly called planned, but which we now berate as command, had its own logic and structure.

"By commodity production," wrote V.I. Lenin, "is meant that organization of a social economy in which products are produced by individual, separate producers, each specializing in the development of some kind of a product, so that, to satisfy social needs, a market is required for the purchase and sale of the products (which become commodities by virtue of this)." The unlimited production of commodities and their sale to any purchaser according to supply and demand prices constitute the distinguishing feature of all commodity production.

And this means that we should have understood, when beginning reform, that a centralized system did not retain the features of a commodity production system. First of all, the producer did not have the necessary freedom. He was instructed from above what and how much and to whom and at what price he had to sell, and from whom and at what price he had to buy, and suppliers and consumers were assigned to him. Only the form of a market economy remained, inasmuch as transactions were concluded with money. On this basis, the well-known scientist-economist N. Khessin showed that a commodity and money under our conditions were deprived of a real cost content. The movement of commodities and their exchange occurred not in conformity to cost phenomena, but according to an order issued from above. The appearance was one thing, but the essence was quite another.

Now we will pose the question: Did the reform of 1987 change the system of economic management that took shape in this country? No, the fundamentals for controlling the economy changed little. Indeed, a broadening of the independence of enterprises and their transition to full economic accountability and self-financing was proclaimed. But at the same time, there was also a retention of centralism and the authority of the departments to determine the priorities and objectives of development, the directions of structural and investment policy, scientific and technical progress, the placement of state orders, and the determination of restrictions and standards. If everything is prescribed for enterprises from above, then their market ties are deprived of that real content that is inherent in them under conditions of a market economy. But then the commodity-monetary relationship is used passively. How can we call our economy a market economy if we do not even have a normal commodity market, not to mention a capital market? Full economic accountability inevitably had to be transformed into the usual unachievable slogan.

Somehow the definition of our society as an administrative system fortuitously came into general use. From this, it followed that the task of reform consists of replacing administrative methods of control with economic methods.

The employment of a centralized system of economic methods is far from being the same as a market economy. The question here should be about a far more serious reform, about a change in the entire system of socioeconomic relationships, a transition from bureaucratic socialism to democratic socialism, of a noncommodity market to a market economy.

The transition to a qualitatively new state of the social economy by no means presupposes a return to the market elements. It denotes the affirmation of the kind of make-up of centralism and regulation of the economy that grew out of the natural needs of production and the market, and that was implemented through the coordination of the interests and actions of all the participants in economic activity.

Not recognizing all the complexities of the task that faced us, we started reform not from the whole, but from a part. We did not consider that it is impossible to change the methods of economic management of an individual enterprise when you leave the system unchanged as a whole. The former limited economic accountability was an organic part of the old system, and valid economic accountability needs a free market system. But if it is absent, then no matter what decisions are made, and no matter what efforts are undertaken, the system tears away everything that is alien. That is why a state order in our country inevitably turns out to be a directive plan, wholesale trade in the form of funded distribution, and why the independence of the collective is reduced to raising wages. That is the reason for the reshuffling with cooperatives. The system remains old, and, therefore, it does not adopt that independence, responsibility, and initiative that are attributes of a different—economic—management.

The demand to dismantle centralized control, which sounded very revolutionary, led to negative consequences in practice. There was a rejection of old mechanisms, but new ones were not introduced. The dismantling of the old system only opened the floodgates

through which unearned rubles flowed into many spheres of the national economy. By comparison with the previous 5-year plan, the mass of money that went into circulation grew by one and a half times with an insignificant growth in national income, consumer goods, and services. As a result, inflation assumed scales heretofore not seen in the life of our generation.

We will continue our conversation about this in the next issue.

Donbass: Implementation of Resolution 608

904F0029A Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 19 Nov 89 pp 2-3

[Article by B. Andriyanov and G. Dorofeyev: "Donbass: Time Has Come For Sober Assessments"]

[Text] Perhaps no government resolution has been monitored on a scale as massive as Resolution 608, the mining resolution. This is good, and even instructive in some of its aspects. Strict accountability makes it impossible to escape by making promises. The people scrupulously record: What has been accomplished? How much has been done? How long has it taken to do it?

As is known, some measures were taken while the strike was still under way —bonuses for night and evening shifts, for travel from the shaft to the stope.... Reporting requirements have been reduced abruptly, and the work assignment system has been simplified. Loans for single-family housing construction have been provided. The Law on Retirement Benefits has been published for public discussion, and it takes the demands of miners into account.... Repeat elections of managers have been held everywhere. Many officials who were far removed from the concerns of the people have had to resign. However, genuine captains of industry and businesslike organizers have been given support. In one of our previous articles, we reported in detail on a conflict situation in the Mine Administration "Socialist Donbass." We are pleased to report this time that Yuriy Ivanovich Baranov whose good name SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA has stood up for has been reelected the Mine Administration director. Another character from a newspaper article, Director of the imeni Gorkiy Mine Vladimir Ivanovich Prishchepa, has also been given the support of the collective.

The miners need complete information on what has been accomplished and what is failing to take place. They talk about the poor supply of material-technical resources, and particularly timber and mine supports, throughout the Donbass. Timber is more than just a material for the mine. This means safe work underground. This means the life of a miner.

At the United Mine in Torez, we saw the results of what is referred to in bureaucratese as "incomplete deliveries." At many points, the roof and flanks of workings are not reinforced. Blocks of rock menacingly hang overhead, and tremendous holes gape. Danger lurks everywhere. Accidents at the imeni Voroshilov Mine in Dzerzhinsk and Aleksandr-West in Gorlovka occurred exactly due to the shortage of timber, as was maintained at the meeting of the Regional Council of Strike Committee. We hope that timber enterprises will appreciate the alarm of miners and the pain of miners' families.

The construction of facilities of social services in the mining areas of the Donbass is failing. Between January and September, the commissioning of overall floor space in residential houses came to 46 percent of the annual plan, in pre-school child care establishments to 33 percent, in clubs to 23 percent, and in polyclinics to a mere 8.7 percent.

All of this is openly discussed at the mines. People understand that the situation can be changed only through the persistent labor of all. Appeals for strikes run into resistance increasingly often. A characteristic dialogue took place at a meeting of the Regional Council of Strike Committees to which a visitor from Vorkuta also came in an effort, as they put it, to fan the flames. He talked at length about his trips all over the country and observed that they have "ideological advisers" in Leningrad. What was the guest from Vorkuta looking for in the Donbass?

He said: "I am looking for support."

A voice from the floor responded immediately: "Would two hours of a warning strike do it for you?"

However, the attitude of the council did not hinge on these retorts. There were many balanced, serious speeches. Representatives of the strike committees of Snezhnyy, Yenakiyevo, Dzerzhinsk, Kirovsk, Torez, and many other cities came out against a strike.

Chairman of the strike committee at the Ordzhonikidzeugol Association F. Kotyuk said: "We are against a political strike. We have our own demands, and we must fight for having them met by other methods."

Chairman of the Dzerzhinsk Strike Committee V. Pavlov said briefly and clearly: "We've decided not to go on strike."

Beginning their strike in summer, the miners criticized sharply the administrative measures for controlling the violators of discipline. Appeals to treat work conscientiously and to reinforce order were heard everywhere. However, the road toward conscious discipline turned out to be complex.

At the Donetsk imeni Gorkiy Mine, miners of the second section decided to go up one hour before the end of the shift. Mining Foreman V. Ostapenko refused to give them exit tokens in an attempt to stop them.

He said: "You've got to work some more. Besides, the shaft is busy delivering the freight."

They bristled at his remark.

They snapped back: "The time has run out for overseers. As for you, we are going to recall you. We have no use for the likes of you."

At present, V. Ostapenko works as an electrician-fitter. Perhaps, the new mining foreman will be mindful of the experience of his predecessor and will be more pliant. Previously, they used to punish the violators of labor discipline. Now, as a matter of fact, the violators of labor discipline suppress those who try to restore order. What will the attitude of the strike committees be toward these conflicts?

Former Head of the Main Administration Nikolay Safonovich Surgay believes: "Unless the course of events is turned around trouble is a certainty. At many enterprises, fuel stocks do not exceed 2 to 3 days, the standard being 2 to 3 months."

We met in his office on the last day of existence of the Main Administration. At one point, this massive building with columns in downtown Donetsk housed the Ministry of the Coal Industry of the republic, and subsequently the territorial administration, and the main administration.... Now the main administration is no more. In keeping with the demand of miners, the Glavdonetskugol was liquidated effective 10 October.

The day after the main administration folded we took a walk down the empty, unusually quiet corridors. The doors of offices were locked; the signs were taken off the doors. It was only on the second floor that we met several people. There were two Ivanovs among them: Yuriy Petrovich and Pavel Nikolayevich. The namesakes were left without a job on the same day.

For a long time, Yuriy Petrovich was the director of the imeni Kalinin Mine. He showed himself to be a marvelous organizer, a contemporary manager. He was among the first to begin building housing with the mine's own resources; he took care of the spare time of miners. The young engineer with a promise was invited to the republic ministry and subsequently to the GPO [State Production Association]. However, in less than a year the GPO was reorganized into a territorial administration. Now there is no administration either.

Yuriy Petrovich says: "I am out of a trade."

Pavel Nikolayevich is a major economist. He was a deputy minister of the coal industry of the republic. He expertly stood up for the interests of the Donbass arguing that both the USSR Gosplan [State Planning Committee] and the USSR Minugleprom [Ministry of the Coal Industry] underestimated the role of the "all-union boiler room." The moneys for the funds of social development of coal enterprises, for science and technology were reduced year after year. In 1989, 50 large production facilities are being mothballed. They include new levels, ventilation shafts, and other facilities on which both the output and the conditions of work depend. In the course of compiling the plan for the coming year, Pavel Nikolayevich argued that this policy is shortsighted. What is going to be forsaken in one year will not be made up for in as many as five. However, he did not make his point stick.

The mining tenure of former Head of the Main Administration Surgay spans almost 40 years. He came to the mine in 1953 after graduating from a vocational technical school. He started out as a mining foreman; he was an assistant section chief, and a section chief. He studied and worked, he worked and studied. The higher he climbed the clearer he saw the unsettled state of the Donbass.

In the last 20 years, R1.6 billion failed to be allocated for its development. The mining assets have not been renewed for many decades. The average depth of the seams worked has come to 700 meters. Twenty-five mines have gone beyond 1,000 meters. Every second mine has seams which pose the danger of sudden outbursts of coal and gas. When talk began to the effect that mining fuel here is not rational, that, supposedly, it is more advantageous to transport it from the eastern regions, Surgay argued, statistics in hand, that this is a local-based rather than state-wide approach. One coal region should not be set against another. They should be developed simultaneously, taking the needs of the national economy into account. It appeared that this approach had won out.

However, two GPOs, in Donetsk and Voroshilovgrad, were subsequently formed from the republic ministry. Things which had evolved and developed within a single complex were torn apart. The union Minugleprom assumed control over research and construction. The repair facilities were carved up "through live flesh." Plants producing coal cutter-loaders, wheeled rock loaders, hydraulic equipment, and electric engines happened to be in Donetsk Oblast whereas electric engine and powered support plants happened to be in Voroshilovgrad Oblast.... Departmental barriers were erected on an even field.

Thus the coal industry of the republic faced a crisis which it has not encountered in, perhaps, its entire history.

Several days ago, a group of members of the collegium of the USSR Minugleprom headed by Minister M.I. Shchadov visited the Donbass. The comrades handled on the spot the issues of the Donbass and of production associations working steeply inclined seams, met with labor collectives and members of strike committees. The specialists of the defunct Glavdonetskugol also expected to meet ministers and members of the collegium. The alarm of the people is understandable: What next? Does the country need their expertise? They expected moral support from the minister, but in vain. The minister left without having met his colleagues.

We wanted very much to find a justification for Mikhail Ivanovich. We understand how busy he is; we appreciate

his unbelievable workload in recent months. Still, we cannot understand indifference with regard to the future of his comrades.

At this point, we recalled a recent encounter in Torez. Over there, a man who is well known to us from past business trips and who has grown old overnight is a patient at the hospital. He showed us his native city, at one time the out-of-the-way mine of Chistyakovo, with much sentiment. General Director of the Coal Association Veniamin Ivanovich Malov did not start us off with the mines and tons of output. First, he took us to the auxiliary farm and showed us around the warehouses where corn was stored carefully, so that not a grain would perish. He showed us vegetable markets and the homes of miners.... At the time we did not manage to pay a visit to the hospital which was erected with his participation. We could not think that we would have to look for Malov here....

"You dirty snout, give us back your million"—this is what they yelled to him at a meeting in the summer.

Fine, at the time emotions prevailed. Let us write them off. However, even now one hears in the strike committee: "Each signature of his cost R2,000."

"Do you have documents, testimony?"

Our interlocutors are hesitant:

"No."

So, is this slander? Libel? However, the rule is that you are held responsible for libel.

The life of Veniamin Ivanovich Malov unfolded in full view of this city. Old miners who restored the mines destroyed in the war remember Venka the craftsman, and the young ones remember Veniamin Ivanovich the general director who, as one of the economic managers noted, "crucified us over these houses." After the strike, the physicians insisted: You have to be hospitalized urgently.

"Let me receive the people, and I will go."

He did so. He heard out all those who had appointments, helped them as much as he could. Then he took down the sign with his name and went to the hospital.

We have asked different interlocutors about Malov. People recalled his exceptional ability to work, his keen sight as an engineer, persistence. "We are grateful to him for keeping the mines here"—said the new party committee secretary Sergey Sinyavskiy at the United Mine. To be sure, they also said that Malov took personal charge of too many things and this, supposedly, made others reluctant to handle them. Indeed, the vigor of Veniamin Ivanovich is enviable. Being 60 "plus" years of age, he managed to work without days off and go down to the mine 15 to 18 times a month. The brief assessment of Sinyavskiy conceals a great story of two mining cities, Torez and Snezhnyy, which were threatened with desolation as recently as 10 to 15 years ago. The mine dies, and, as a rule, the settlement dies with it. Malov did not let the mines die. He proved that there is coal here, and that it can be mined. One still wants to believe that the cities saved will appreciate this at the very least.

...Our conversation with the former Head of the Main Administration Surgay was interrupted by guests from the strike committee—L. Tolstikova, A. Mudrik, and A. Krivolapov.

Tolstikova cut into the conversation: "Don't spread panic. There is coal at the mines; we've looked into this."

Surgay took the last summary report: The stocks of fuel were below the critical mark. However, the guests tolerated no objections and took no arguments into account. Meanwhile, the facts were grave.

In analyzing the work of miners in the Donbass this year, let us distinguish two stages: Before the strike, January through July, and after. In the first half of the year, 894 breakage stopes and 2,300 development stopes were in operation. Over this period of time, 1,381,000 tons of coal were produced above the plan. The plan for the delivery of coking coal was 105 percent fulfilled. Nine out of 10 production associations were, as they say, running ahead of schedule. Between January and July, over R5 million were saved, and almost R70 million of profits were generated. This is how the mines performed before the strike.

This is how they performed after the strike. In the last three months, 13 breakage stopes have been lost, and 36 kilometers of mine workings have not been put in. The amount of output declined by 4.8 million tons. There is no above-the-plan account anymore. Worse yet, there are arrears of a'most 500,000 tons, and R66.5 million in profits have been lost. At a number of mines, the miners are living on credit. The debt to the bank exceeds R17 million.

A telegram from the Krivoy Rog Coke Chemistry Plant addressed to the miners of the Donbass says: "From July on, our collective has been facing the danger of a shutdown due to the shortage or absolute absence of concentrates. The technological schedule for the operation of 10 coke-oven batteries is being violated. In the third quarter alone, the collective failed to turn out products worth R2.7 million due to the non-delivery of more than 130,000 tons of coal concentrates. Losses in profits and the economic incentives fund amounted to R500,000. Each family of coal chemistry workers is missing R30 in its budget."

Disruptions in the operation of coke chemistry plants have brought about disrupting the pace of operation of metallurgical installations and the entire industry. At present, the most important objective is to improve labor discipline and to reinforce organization and order.

Agricultural

Gorbachev Talk at Agricultural Meeting Viewed

PM0112121089 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Nov 89 Second Edition p 1

[Article by D. Valovoy and A. Platoshkin under the rubric "Topical Theme": "Land Awaits Master"]

[Text] As the press has already reported, on 22 November in the CPSU Central Committee a meeting took place between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and secretaries of the union republic communist party central committees and party kray committees and oblast committees [kraykoms and obkoms] in charge of questions of the agro-industrial complex. There was an exchange of opinions on questions of modern agrarian policy, the assimilation of new economic relations in the countryside, and the cadres, organizational, and resource backup for the tasks of developing the country's food complex. M.S. Gorbachev spoke at the meeting. He gave a detailed, thorough analysis of the political and economic situation in the country and described the state and development prospects of the agrarian sector.

Our party is consistently implementing the course it has projected for accelerating socioeconomic development. That applies both to the country as a whole and to the agrarian sector. Within the framework of perestroyka definite advances have appeared here. In a number of oblasts and republics there has been a marked increase in the production and sale of agricultural output and the population's food supply has improved. Nonetheless the prolonged stagnation, including in the agrarian sector, has not made it possible to assume the necessary momentum here or to scale the heights set. There is still an acutely felt shortage of food and raw material for the processing industry.

Despite the fact that grain production this year was about 210 million tonnes its sale to the state was less than 60 million tonnes. While formerly even with smaller gross harvests grain purchases were far greater. Procurements of other crops and stockraising output are proceeding slowly and in some places are even declining. The imperfection of economic relations is also manifested here. The meeting spoke in detail of how to overcome the food shortage and interest the peasants in good, highly productive labor. To achieve a breakthrough more rapidly in the agrarian sector we must continue to improve economic strategy, resolutely renouncing obsolete methods of leadership and the administrative-edict system.

The creation of a real, successfully functioning mechanism for improving food matters, the meeting's participants said, is not a short-term campaign. This is a complex, painstaking matter. It requires the party committees' close, daily attention. Every condition for creative work has now been created in them. It is important that they pursue agrarian policy in a competent, skilled manner, and not through pressure but through people, arming them with economic methods of work and modern technologies.

M.S. Gorbachev noted that an important task is monitoring the fulfillment of the decisions by whose means agrarian policy is pursued. The emphasis should be on improving, intensifying, and developing leading salients in the agrarian sector. That applies in particular to the assimilation of new technologies. In arable farming, for instance, as the experience of many farms and regions has shown, new technologies, with skilled use, can ensure an additional 10 quintals of grain and more per hectare and repay expenses with interest. That, I think, is convincing proof of how essential it is now to accelerate the working out and adoption of the "grain" program, paying special attention in it to intensive technologies and the price factor. Resolute, radical measures are needed to combat losses and the irrational use of grain. Indeed, it is hard to come to terms with the fact that a substantial proportion of the harvest literally vanishes from our hands because of backward harvesting, storage, transportation, and processing methods.

Perestroyka in machine building is being implemented only slowly and the quality of the equipment which arrives is poor. There are many cases of old machines being taken out of production with no new ones on offer. There is a great deal of talk in the countryside about power units and minitractors. But they are reaching the peasants' premises and the lessees in miserly quantities. The rural workers are pinning great hopes on conversion. Defense industry enterprises are so far justifying these hopes only feebly and are in no hurry to turn their attention to the countryside. Their machinery for fields and stockraising units can so far be seen only at exhibitions and in experimental models. The prices are often exorbitant.

Of course, the creation of a firm foundation for the agro-industrial complex is no simple matter. It requires considerable expenditure. The pace of advance cannot always coincide with that on which we had counted. But marking time and deviating from the positions which have been gained is totally unforgivable. For instance, many rebukes were voiced against material and technical supplies. In the speakers' opinion they have even deteriorated. The countryside is only poorly supplied, sometimes even only according to the residual principle, with fuel, equipment, materials, and resources. The constant rise in prices for these is preventing many farms from really finding their feet and emerging from debt slavery. The lack of price parity, whereby less is paid for a kilogram of excellent wheat than, for instance, for a bottle of mineral water, and the directive-based planning which persists locally for production and purchases of output are undermining the foundations of the farms' economic autonomy. It is not general political arguments, and especially not gloating over such shortcomings, which are required of Communists, but a knowledge of specific conditions and the ability to think and act on a broad scale, with a consideration for the real

situation. Have all Communists, party committees, and their leaders fully mastered these qualities? Life convinces us that far from all of them have. Frankly, the theme of reshaping economic relations in the countryside was not heard loudly in the speeches of many of those taking part in the conference. This obviously largely reflects the practice of work.

For instance, today an unfavorable situation with regard to norms is taking place in a number of regions of the country. Consequently, organizational and economic measures are needed to prevent a reduction in the production of milk and meat and the "dropping off" of the livestock population. There is sorry experience of this kind. Individual oblasts and republics, having once reduced the number of animals, restored them to their previous volume only 5 years later.

Practice also gives examples of a creative approach toward the matter. In particular the meeting named Moscow Oblast, where the party and economic organs are paying scant attention to the sector's intensification. The number of cows here has declined in the past five years. On the other hand milk yields from each cow have risen from 3,383 kg to 4,000 kg. The production and sale of milk have increased 117.3 and 114.4 percent respectively.

The creation of a successfully functioning agrarian sector is inconceivable without economic autonomy, economic accountability [khozraschet], and the contract. Where the lease has been assimilated, production output is rapidly increased 50-100 percent. If you judge by report figures, the overwhelming majority of crop farmers and many stock raisers have switched to the lease and contract. The question naturally arises: Why is the yield from fields and stockraising units not increasing just as rapidly?

Economic levers are not working because they often applied only formally. They still serve for many people as a fashionable cover for obsolete approaches toward matters, as a camouflage to inertia, carelessness, and indifference. There is wholesale "leasization" without serious economic preparation. Is that not the most graphic example of modern bureaucracy, of working not for the sake of the cause but for the notorious checkmark in the report! Making a deeper analysis of the progress of perestroyka in the agro-industrial complex and resolutely clearing the obstacles in its path—that, I think, is the party organs' most important political task.

The key to its solution lies in the position of man, in his interest in the end results. How to overcome the shortage of such interest which still exists? Life and practice show that for this it is necessary to observe in practice the principle whereby he who has worked best receives more. Forms of organizing matters can be varied here. On the unfailing condition that the collective and the worker themselves dispose of the means and results of labor. There is an increasing number of such masters in the countryside. The adoption of the laws on the lease, the land, and ownership will help their education.

During the years of perestroyka much has also been done to improve peasants' labor conditions and daily life. Apartment blocks and settlements are being erected with urban amenities as are schools, stores, hospitals, and clubs. Thousands of kilometers of roads have provided a link between remote rural areas and farm centers and rayon centers. It is possible to name many oblasts and rayons where the outflow of the rural population has ceased, where young people are returning from the plants and construction sites to the lands of their fathers and grandfathers. The experience of the party committees and economic leaders who are rendering all-around aid to the newcomers is worthy of attention. This aid is primarily in the construction of housing.

Nonetheless the pace of the countryside's renewal and its rapprochement with the city can scarcely be termed satisfactory. There is an acute shortage of construction materials and equipment. The contracting organizations are feeble and there are often no cheap projects for housing and production premises. The meeting cited examples of the funds earmarked for the development of the social sphere being chronically underassimilated. Lack of attention toward this sphere and the merely verbal recognition of the equality of the city and the countryside—that is perhaps the real reason for the prolonged stagnation of the rural economy in a number of regions of the country.

The success of perestroyka in the agrarian sector depends directly and immediately on the professional training of cadres. Of those employed on the field and in the stockraising units, of those who head the link, team, collective farm, or state farm. The lease, the contract, and other progressive forms are advancing to the fore people with a practical streak, as they say. But natural qualities must also be developed and supplemented with knowledge of technology and methods of economic management and administration. The party organizations' role is particularly great in educating these cadres. Their ability to select people, to check them in deeds, to raise them as intelligent specialists, aware and active fighters for perestroyka is particularly necessary now. An atmosphere of creative quest and mutual demandingness and exactingness—that is perhaps the best school where real masters of the land are educated.

The party and the country are advancing toward the 28th CPSU Congress. The rural communists and workers in the agro-industrial complex, in preparing for the congress, are analyzing the experience of perestroyka and seeking new approaches toward the solution of the food problem. And, as is well known, he who seeks shall find!

Scientific

Kvant-2-Mir Docking Set for 6 Dec

LD0512114589 Moscow World Service in English 0800 GMT 5 Dec 89

[Text] Mission control of the Soviet space module "Kvant-2" is preparing for another attempt to dock it with the orbiting station "Mir".

Our correspondent reports that the sophisticated operation is expected at 12 hours 20 minutes UTC tomorrow [6 December].

The first attempt last Saturday failed. Electronic devices halted the approach of the multiton apparatus at a distance of 20 kilometers. All the systems of the module and the station are functioning normally. The crew of the "Mir" station, Viktorenko and Serebrov, are preparing to receive the new lab.

Large Communications Satellites Proposed

907Q0024A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Nov 89 First Edition p 6

[B. Konovalov and S. Leskov report: "Energiya for the Entire Planet. Operating on 1.5 Million Channels, an Automatic Telephone Exchange in Space Will Solve the Problems of Telephone Communications on Earth"]

[Text] The first official visit of journalists to the legendary Korolev Design Bureau, known from many newspaper reportages and now part of the Energiya Scientific-Production Association, took place on 14 November. The general director, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences Yu.P. Semenov, reported that the second launch of the Energiya launch vehicle and the Buran orbital vehicle, developed here in cooperation with other organizations, will take place next year. The most attractive of future projects is a universal space platform capable of insuring the creation of a new global communications system and of providing ecological monitoring of our planet.

How did it come about that a group of space institutes and enterprises came into being in the quiet settlement of dachas at Podlipki near Moscow? In 1920 the Petrograd Weapons Plant, founded way back in 1866 and where M.I. Kalinin at one time worked, was evacuated there to the former property of the tea magnate Perlov. Series production of tank guns and antitank and antiaircraft guns was organized there. In 1938 the settlement of Podlipki became the city of Kaliningrad. And from 1946 its development was associated with the name of S.P. Korolev and space vehicle technology. It was here that the first series- produced Soviet rockets, satellites, space vehicles, and orbital stations were developed and created.

One of S.P. Korolev's closest associates, Hero of Socialist Labor and corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences B.Ye. Chertok, recalls that the first Soviet Molniya-1 satellite was developed at the enterprise. And now specialists at the scientific-production association are proposing to use the powerful Energiya carrier to solve the problem of communications in our country, which in this field lags 10 or 15 years behind the developed countries. As an example: in the non-Chernozem zone alone there are 20,000 populated points that have no means of communication, not even a telephone. According to calculations done by the Ministry of Communications, solving the problem using traditional methods will require and astronomical sum—R60 billion. But the development of space communications will be tens of times cheaper and there will be a sharp increase in the rates at which the system itself is developed.

But this is the problem: Which way to go? In the West they prefer to use high-quality electronics to develop small specialized satellites with an orbital life of 10 to 15 years. There are already two international commercial satellite communications systems. The INTELSAT satellites are for transmitting television programs and communications with stationary targets. The INMARSAT system serves the world fleets and others in movement, right down to people driving ordinary cars. In the USSR a national system has been developed for communications via satellites. The overwhelming majority of them were developed under the leadership of Academician M.F. Reshetnev, who heads the Scientific-Production Association of Applied Mechanics in Krasnoyarsk. He is also proposing further development of this system by evolution, gradually replacing existing satellites with more advanced ones.

But specialists at the Energiya Scientific-Production Association want to make a revolutionary leap forward in the development of space communications. The Proton carrier vehicle, which at present is used to place communications satellites in geostationary orbits, can deliver a payload of 2.4 tonnes. And this means that to develop a space communications system requires many satellites. The imperfect nature of our electronics limits the life of the satellites to 3 to 5 years. Consequently, frequent replacements in orbit are often required, and as a result there is a large number of Proton launches.

The Energiya carrier vehicle with an additional booster, which is now being developed at the scientific-production association, will make it possible to loft a significantly larger payload into geostationary orbit—18 tonnes—and create large universal platforms to replace several ordinary satellites. A large-diameter antenna measuring 30 meters could be installed on this platform and this will make it possible to simplify and reduce the cost of ground reception equipment. Even today the fantastic possibility of setting up personal communications with individual people via a device the size of a wrist watch is opening up. But what is even more important is that thanks to the large weight reserve on the platform it is possible to triple the systems and even with our electronics achieve a service life of 10 years.

The deputy general director of the USSR Ministry of Communications Kvazar Scientific-Production Association, Ye.F. Kamnev, acquainted the journalists with the comparative analysis of different versions for using geostationary platforms. They can be used to support direct multiprogram television broadcasting to small antennas, telephone, telegraph, and facsimile communications via 1.5 million channels, and communications

with stationary or moving targets, and for communications with moving ships, trains, and cars, and expeditions located in regions difficult of access. There is one version that makes comprehensive use of all three scenarios. Analysis shows that despite the large initial costs the system will provide a good return.

The conversion now taking place in the country will in principle also provide the capacities required to develop both the space and the ground equipment. But international cooperation and joint-venture enterprises with foreign companies will greatly accelerate the business and would make it possible to obtain even greater returns by using high-quality electronics.

However, large geostationary platforms do have an "Achilles' heel." A complex system also means complex guidance and cumbersome auxiliary systems. The main thing is that the loss in case of an accident during launch or early loss of work capacity when the platform is in orbit would be too great. And so the USSR Council of Ministers is also organizing a competition for projects (apparently the first in the history of space exploration) for the space communications system of the future. A comprehensive analysis will be made to determine which project is considered the best.

But Yu.P. Semenov is convinced that large geostationary platforms are promising and that if no government subsidies are available he is ready (and this is definitely a first) to take a bank loan to realize the project. In any event, the Energiya Scientific-Production Association plans in 3 years to carry out a demonstration launch of a large geostationary platform so that all states in the world can become aware of its unique capabilities.

Any discussion of conversion at the Energiya Scientific-Production Association would be incomplete is we limited ourselves only to satellite communications systems, promising as they are. At the head space design bureau work has started on prostheses, and a shop for this has already been set up. The suffering of our disabled people and the powerlessness of the enterprises that are designed directly to help them are well known. During the 6 weeks of work on the new discipline at the Energiya Scientific-Production Association, models of prostheses made from space materials have already been developed to imitate the step movement and bending of the foot. The plan for the scientific-production association is 350,000 to 400,000 prostheses each year, and also the organization throughout the country of permanent and mobile centers for individual fitting of prostheses.

Problems Facing Satellite Program Viewed

PM3011144189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Nov 89 Second Edition pp 1, 3

[Report by special correspondent N. Krivomazov and TASS correspondent Yu. Khots under the rubric "Top Secret": "'Granit' Is Not Stone: Don't Crush It!"]

[Excerpts] Krasnoyarsk Kray—[Passage omitted] The Sayany marble deposit resembles an Italian one. You could even sculpt a Venus from such marble. But when it was decided to dam the Yenisey in these parts, a road was needed. Blasts began ringing out over the splendid marble. Drillers broke up the age-old strata and scarred the deposit. On the other hand, much rubble was obtained and used to pave the road to the hydroelectric station....

Is there not a risk of something similar happening with conversion, the thought occurred to us on the way to the "forbidden city." This is the name given to this Siberian city, which is not marked on the map. Would we not break up the mighty stratum which, say what you like, has taken shape in the military-industrial complex? Would we not once again pave our road with golden "rubble"? And would we not find ourselves left at the side of the road as the result of misunderstood conversion? [Passage omitted]

Practically all communications satellites came into being right here, on the Yenisey.

It was here that the national satellite television system—satellites of the "Molniya" series—was created. The almost 100 "Orbita" ground stations operating in the country were conceived in Siberia. As well as the "Gorizont" satellite, created for the 1980 Olympics. Thanks to it, more than 1.5 billion of the planet's inhabitants watched Moscow through "Yenisey eyes." Last year alone, according to USSR Communications Ministry data, the saving made as a result of operating satellite communications systems totaled more than R500 million.

"Strange as it may seem, the at-first-glance costly space communications systems are the cheapest and, perhaps, the only correct way to save public money," A. Kozlov, first deputy general designer and general director, entered the conversation. "For example, satellite systems make it possible to read PRAVDA in Krasnoyarsk almost sooner than in Moscow. Or let's take navigational safety systems. Thus, 'Glonas' ('Global Navigation Satellite System') ensures that one's position can be determined with an accuracy as good as 100 meters at any point on the world's surface. A special system has even been created to observe the wavering of the earth's axis, in order to make the necessary adjustments. When creating such systems we have to study many questions and physical phenomena. For example, the phenomenon of electrifying a satellite. The need to calibrate the orbit. Account is even taken of solar pressure...."

Then came a pause, which the shop chief took advantage of to bring us back down to earth.

"We are only on the approaches to truly modern communications," he began. "We are still struggling with the telephones. To ring my mother in Dimitrovgrad I have to go the post office a week in advance at 0500 hours to book the call."

"I dare say your mother will forgive you," Deputy General Designer A. Kozlov commented. "But how can we explain things to outsiders? For example, we were at the USSR State Bank. In the world at large it takes up to 15 minutes to conclude one banking operation, whereas it takes us 15 days to finalize everything. I asked the State Bank chairman how much such inefficiency costs us, and I heard: Billions of rubles! This means that new satellites and new communications channels are needed."

Or another example.

The "Energiya" carrier rocket is a large rocket, a "tsar-rocket," as A. Kozlov called it. And here he reminded us that the Tsar-cannon has never been fired and the Tsar-bell never rung. But here the thing has been done: "Energiya" has been created. This means a Tsar-satellite must be attached to it, does it not? And then the idea emerges of a giant 18-tonne communications satellite to take almost 1 million telephone numbers! "God help us," people in the "forbidden city" say almost with one voice. "How can there be 1 million telephones when here, on earth, there is a shortage of telephone equipment, wires from yard to yard, and ordinary telephone stations? This is the old megalomania, in which there is no place for everyday 'trifles.'"

"In short, you propose coming down to the person?" we asked the general designer, and we heard this reply:

"Going up, rising up to him."

Then let us speak in greater detail about the kind of conversion being called for on the Yenisey today. Because it is impossible to hide the fact that the local economy, which is accustomed to being "doped with weapons," is faced with a process of agonizingly kicking the habit. At the same time the simplest thing for such a "state within a state" is to open its borders and become "like everyone else." But no, "we have no need of such a ball game!" We do not need to fight the rich but to struggle to ensure that there are no poor people.

This is what M. Lubnin, director of the Siberian branch of the Machine Building Technology Scientific Research Institute, says about such difficult topics. What he says is connected with the regular opening up of glasnost and conversion. Krasnoyarsk has just gotten one more educational institution. Some 30 years after it was created here, a so-called higher technical educational institution [VTUZ], whose graduates have provided more than one general designer, has been declassified. It is the Institute of Space Technology.

"Does the new uniform suit the VTUZ, and has it not put it on rather late? And why does it have any need at all for once-fashionable attire which no longer shines with its former brilliance?" M. Lubnin asked. And he himself replied: "The doubts are unfounded. Space technology is the high mark to which the scientific and technical standard of the whole national economy, and machine building above all, must be raised for production of consumer goods and other civilian output.

"That is, we must not lower but raise demands on ourselves and on people. I believe that this concept will suit everyone. Because the overloading of our economy with spending on arms was one of the causes of omissions in the area of expanding the infrastructure and the education system. In general, my military brothers, it is time to pay the debts, as the saying is these days."

The discussion of the "forbidden city's" new economy continued. F. Klimov, deputy general economic director of the science and production association, spoke:

"We are the only enterprise in the country to work from the project through to the finished product and to participate in the operation of communications satellites registered in orbit. By way of comparison, I will say that in the United States approximately 20 firms are involved with communications satellites. Such a monopoly poses a number of questions. We believe that we are finding the answers to them. The point is that production and science have always been two different types of activity. Two types of planning and accountability even exist for them. But how can 'the horse and the timid deer' be harnessed to the same space carriage?

"In the search for such a harness the sector arrived at self-financing. But the Siberians did not want to be 'like everyone else.' So, with the blessing of S. Sitaryan, former deputy chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee, they tackled the second form of economic accountability—6 months before everyone else. And then they took the risk of switching to the lease or, rather, to the lease form of economic accountability, because there is still a long way to go to true leasing in the USSR."

At this point we interrupted Fedor Sergeyevich with, in our view, a risky question: What will happen if "defense" leases from the state its tastiest morsels?

Then F. Klimov began comparing figures for the last and the present half-years. The total volume of work has increased 80 percent. The volume of experimental work has trebled. Consumer goods—50 percent; civilian output—12 times. And all this, we will repeat, in a collective which has never allowed itself indulgences and, to put it mildly, has had extremely strenuous plans. And here is another result. Labor productivity in the shops has increased 10 percent on their own work. Wages? This is the root of everything. For the umpteenth month now no one here has received the bonuses they used to be entitled to. The final reckoning is done on the year's results. Only after settling everything with the state. Taxation is the only worry. A sizable sum is due to everyone at the end of the year. Will the new tax not "eat" into it? Then it will turn out that the new perestroyka legislation will lie like a log in the path of economic progress. And this can on no account be permitted.

As we see, the economy also has its own conversion. This is a profound, deep-seated process, which has been approached extremely seriously here in Siberia. And then comes an increasingly logical movement of thoughts and deeds. Yes, conversion is truly the command of the times. But it is criminal, to say the least, to approach it with a single yardstick. Today funding here has been cut on all counts. Whereas previously all the sisters had earrings, as the saying goes, now each sister has one earring.

We stayed briefly in one of the shops to photograph "Molniya-3." But the designers brushed it aside—old hat, they said. It will hold out for 2 more years, and then it will have to be changed for "Granit." It is also time to add "Gelikon" to "Ekran," whose approximately 6,000 stations enable the inhabitants of the most remote, out-of-the-way corners to receive television programs. The fate of this new communications satellite has been discussed in the Central Committee Politburo—this product is of such significance.

But here is the rub. Who will finance it? The military, whose belt we have tightened, is beginning to shy away from "nonprofile" subjects. The Ministry of Communications will not be equal to a statewide task on its own. The government program is under threat of failure.

"It is necessary to decide, and not 'adopt a decision,' as we have taken to putting it recently." General Designer M. Reshetnev is categorical on this point. "It is necessary without delay to define priorities and publicly renounce a number of subjects, and to devote all our energies to carrying out what is left. Otherwise there will be an immediate slackening of pace, and our whole space chariot will come to a halt. Even if we abandon all topics after "evenly" distributing the cut funds, we will still be unable, like Christ, to feed our world with seven loaves. Today we have built up an unprecedented pace: We can renew output every 3-4 years. Averaged financing will at once double this time to 6-8 years. Is such conversion needed?"

...On taking our leave, we put a final question to Mikhail Fedorovich: Who will have the boldness and the authority to revise the existing programs with regard to each enterprise, not in words but in fact?

This was the only question to which we never received a reply on that day.

Military

'Balanced' Approach to Test Range Urged

PM0412141389 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 29 Nov 89 First Edition p 4

[Interview with USSR People's Deputy Colonel N.S. Petrushenko by Lieutenant Colonel V. Kosarev under the "Viewpoint" rubric: "Colonel N. Petrushenko: I Favor a Balanced Approach"—date and place unspecified; first two paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] Of all the questions discussed recently at the USSR Supreme Soviet session, one of the most important, of concern to each one of us, is the question of urgent measures to improve the country's ecological health. The problem has been urgent for some time. Chernobyl, Baykal, the Aral region—these and many other names have become synonymous with human tragedy. One of the deputies showed a photograph at the session of an eight-legged foal born in the region of the Chernobyl tragedy. Can we really speed into the future on such a steed, he asked?

The session also raised the question of the delay in closing the Semipalatinsk Nuclear Test Range. A somewhat different view on this score was expressed by Colonel N.S. Petrushenko, a people's deputy from Kazakhstan, whose speech was supported by a number of other deputies. Our parliamentary correspondent asked Nikolay Semenovich to comment on it in greater detail.

[Petrushenko] I took the rostrum at the session at the demand of my voters. Out of the 65 cities in the country which we class as ecological disaster areas 4 either are located or else are "smoking" on the territory of my electoral okrug. Their enterprises discharge around 70 harmful substances into the atmosphere. Unfortunately, operational air pollution monitoring is conducted on the basis of just six indicators. Even mercury discharges are not recorded, since we do not have the appropriate apparatus.

Yes, we are proud that the output of the Ust-Kamenegorsk Lead and Zinc Combine is registered as a standard on the London Metal Exchange. But, while they are earning foreign currency, our ministries and departments are leaving contaminated land, water, and air behind for the population of the area.

The problem of the burial of radioactive waste is of particular concern. More than 70,000 radioactive sources are currently located in Kazakhstan in 8,664 installations. Approximately 1 in every 10 of these sources will have to be buried. These installations belong to the State Agro-Industrial Committee, the Ministry of Light Industry, the Ministry of Power and Electrification, and so forth. I am not talking about the sources held by Defense Ministry installations. But if I said that we have far fewer than the State Agroindustrial Committee, probably few people would believe it, even though it is true. Currently the burial of radioactive waste is the task of the housing and municipal services. But I think that it is wrong to entrust such a serious matter to people armed with spades and shovels. It would be more sensible to assign the matter to the Ministry of Nuclear Power Generation and the Nuclear Industry, for instance.

[Kosarev] Nikolay Semenovich, the question of the Semipalatinsk Nuclear Test Range was raised very acutely at the session. Many speakers advocated its immediate closure. You have a different opinion on this. What are your arguments?

[Petrushenko] My position is the following. Article 103 of the USSR Constitution obliges me as a people's deputy to strive to carry out my voters' instructions. One of these instructions is the closure of the Semipalatinsk Test Range. This demand is now being heard all over—at meetings with voters, in the newspapers, on television, and at rallies. Unfortunately, in the heat of the election campaign when we were making promises to the voters, we failed to consider the actual concept of just what the Semipalatinsk Test Range is. Even the USSR Supreme Soviet draft resolution calls it a nuclear weapons test range. This name is by no means accurate. It is a scientific research institute of a certain kind, where military matters are by no means the most important. I recently visited the Ministry of Nuclear Power Generation and the Defense Ministry and met with Academician Ye.P. Velikhov, other specialists, and scientists and the collective from the Semipalatinsk Nuclear Explosions Center, and the more I looked into the problem the more I came to the view that its resolution should be approached in a very considered, extremely balanced, and sober fashion.

Closing the test range, as certain official and "informal" organizations in the republic and many people's deputies are demanding, would mean ending the activity of one of the country's largest scientific centers, where there are thousands of scientists and an established research infrastructure, and where very important state tasks are resolved.

Yes, I, like my voters, am wholly in favor of ending nuclear weapons tests. But I am convinced that this is only possible on a bilateral basis. Speaking at the session of parliament, it was no accident that I asked A.I. Lukyanov in the chair how the U.S. Congress had reacted to our recent appeal to it to ban nuclear weapons. This appeal, like the many that preceded it, including our unilateral moratorium on nuclear weapons tests, was ignored. Why?

Why did France carry out a third underground nuclear explosion while the second session of the USSR Supreme Soviet is sitting? I am a military man and I know the answer to these questions. I also know that Pakistan, Israel, and South Africa are threatening to acquire nuclear weapons. And if the reality of the threat of war—which still objectively exists—requires that we concern ourselves with the country's security, we should do so. That is why I considered it necessary at the session to bluntly and candidly state, bearing in mind the speeches by certain deputies, that our activities are sometimes more reminiscent of collective irresponsibility than of collective responsibility. I well recall the words of one of my voters, who said at an election meeting: "If trouble starts, I would very much want my grandson not to have to take up a rifle like his grandfather had to in 1941." So where can we test weapons if we are faced with the need to test them? Let's think about it.

[Kosarev] Nikolay Semenovich, you brought a dosimeter to the session. Had you decided to measure the radiation level in the Kremlin?

[Petrushenko] Yes, I measured the radiation right there on the rostrum. You will recall that the level was 0.11 microroentgens—approximately the same as in Shaft No 12 at the Semipalatinsk Test Range, where the last explosion took place. I did not want to imply by this that nuclear explosions are something akin to perfume production. But I would very much like us to organize production of such meters—perhaps this would help to remove the radiation phobia which is currently very prevalent in this country. There is the same atmosphere around nuclear scientists as there was around scientists in the thirties—it is well described in Dudintsev's "White Coats" and Granin's "The Buffalo." At the Supreme Soviet library I flicked through files of the newspapers of that period—reports on rallies at which the supporters of Weismann and Morgan held forth—and they were very reminiscent of our debates.

Sentiment against the test range is often based on emotion rather than on fact. We in Kazakhstan have published press statements by certain "informals" alleging that experiments on people of the indigenous nationality were held during the fifties. As the saying goes, there is no need to go any further.

[Kosarev] And yet you will agree that the problem of the test range did not come out of the blue. I have been there and met with residents in local population centers, and I know that they have plenty of reasons for being dissatisfied.

[Petrushenko] I do not want to deny that there is a problem. But the problem lies elsewhere. The native population's living conditions cannot stand up to any criticism. The social sphere has been neglected, there is a lack of proper food and medical services... These questions must be urgently resolved.

Some things, of course, are being done. Funds have been allocated under the government resolution to develop the region. But when I looked at the USSR Council of Ministers resolution adopted late last year, I discovered that it is planned to build another installation—a sheep slaughterhouse—in the villages near the test range. Is this right? That is something else worth discussing at the session.

Plane Crash Highlights Shortage of Survival Gear

PM0412155989 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 30 Nov 89 First Edition p 3

[Lieutenant Colonel V. Poluyanov dispatch: "Tragedy at Sea"]

[Text] Pacific Fleet—On 23 November a Pacific Fleet Tu-22 naval aircraft crashed on its way back from a

training area in the Tatar Strait. The crew of four, headed by Military Pilot First Class Major V. Zertsaloviy, was killed.

A competent commission from Moscow is investigating the causes of the crash. It will not be easy for the specialists to establish them. The aircraft sank to a depth of over 100 meters.

So far the following has been established. The crew baled out. Passing aircraft spotted two of the crew members from their parachute canopies floating on the waves. The air operations control group organized the search and rescue work. The aviators acted resolutely and were well coordinated. But they had little chance of rescuing their comrades. In this regiment none of the fliers wears high-latitude sea rescue outfits during the flights, as these have been in short supply for many years. Experience shows that a person in the sea in winter without special equipment dies of hypothermia in 10-20 minutes. The rescue helicopter only reached the scene of the crash half an hour later. Problems arose immediately. Because of the deficiencies of the rescue equipment, one of the victims was winched aboard the helicopter, but the other one drowned before the very eyes of the helicopter crew. Doctors could not save the man who was winched up.

Once again questions arise: When will we learn how to rescue people in such disasters? Will reliable rescue equipment be available for them? After all, military pilots fly over the ocean every day....

Defense Industries Continue Conversion

LD0512023389 Moscow World Service in English 1600 GMT 4 Dec 89

[Text] Soviet defense industries will soon start the production of portable television sets, personal computers, sports equipment, and other consumer goods. Under the conversion program, arms manufacturing plants have already turned out R7 million worth of products in the outgoing year. These include footwear, clothes, sports gear, prefabricated summer cottages, and other various household electronic appliances. Conversion has affected about 350 plants and shops of the defense complex. By the end of the year the share of civilian products and their output will total 43 percent.

Problem of Draft Dodging Considered

PM3011140789 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 28 Nov 89 pp 1, 4

[I. Chernyak article under the rubric "Topic for Reflection": "Fall Draft"]

[Text] Day was breaking. In Vavilov Street the janitor's workday had begun before anyone else's—he was making such a noise with a worn-out broom, as though he had set himself the goal of waking up the whole district. Buses were setting down their first passengers outside the "Akademicheskaya" subway station. Moscow's Cheremushki district was rousing itself from sleep....

A militia "gazik" automobile pulled up outside an old five-story building. An officer, a militia sergeant, and a guy in civilian clothes with an Order of the Red Star on his jacket, leaped from the vehicle. They went up to the fifth floor and rang the bell. The door was opened by a sleepy woman. "Is your son at home? We will expect him downstairs with his things in 15 minutes."

"We used to draft people into the Army with flowers and 'The Slav Woman's Farewell,'" Rayon Military Commissar V. Tyurin drew deeply on his cigarette. "Now we more often have to 'go get' them."

Tyurin has combat awards and is not inclined to panic. Is he himself to blame for bringing guys to the military commissariat under "escort?" But what can you do, if each one has been sent five or six summonses?

"We lose heart," military commissariat officers said. "As soon as the draft is announced, there is a long line of moms and dads, counterfeit certificates, fictitious doctor's notes. Then they run away...."

This fall 72 people have been sent to Kashchenko Mental Clinic from this rayon alone for mutilating or slashing themselves, or just malingering. People come to the medical commission having swallowed a lot of pills, they beat their head against the wall.... The means of trying to evade service are so refined that they would not even occur to a normal person....

But things are little better in other rayons of Moscow! One person in every 10 evades the draft in Oktyabrskiy Rayon, while in Sverdlovskiy Rayon half the draftees fail to report to the military commissariat the first time and there are dozens of "refuseniks." I could continue the examples.

At the Ground Forces Political Directorate I was shown reports from military districts.

From the Transcaucasus Military District: "The situation has become extremely complex.... A number of military commissariats are blockaded.... There are hunger strikes, sitdown strikes.... A coordinating committee has been set up to boycott the draft.... A boycott is taking place while soviet, party, and law-enforcement organs stand idle.... N. Mgeliashvili, first secretary of Tianetskiy Georgian Communist Party Rayon Committee, bluntly stated: 'I am one of the people. And the people do not want to serve....' An attempt was made on the life of Major General A. Arutyunyan, military commissar of Armenia. A crowd beat him up for more than 20 minutes. He was fortunate not to get killed...."

From the Baltic Military District: "Picketing of military commissariats is assuming a mass nature.... Inscriptions on placards: 'By going to serve in the ranks of the Armed Forces of the Soviet Empire you run the risk of becoming a killer of other peoples' women and children,' and 'We

demand an end to the fall draft....' Anti-Army rallies are being held.... Leaflets are being produced urging people to go to jail rather than serve in the 'army of occupation.'"

From the Turkestan Military District: "Military commissariats are being blockaded, assembly points boycotted.... There have been attempts to thwart draftee sendoffs, to prevent trams from entraining.... Parents are blackmailed, hunger strikes are provoked, and ultimatums are issued to refuse the draft.... In a number of population centers in Uzbekistan and Turkmenia, troop trains have been pelted with rocks and bottles...."

There are alarming reports from other regions, too. It is time to call things by their proper names: A mass anti-Army attack and a boycott of military service are being mounted.

Bayonet in the Ground?

Why has this happened? I have put this question to many people. Instead of replying, one officer recalled the words of a military leader: "Four newspapers can do more harm than a 100,000-strong enemy army."

Yes, many negative phenomena in the Army have become public knowledge, including the bullying, the local associations, the accidents, and the disasters. But newspapers have "highlighted" shortcomings in other spheres of life, too—what can be done if so many sores have accumulated?

"All society's ills, especially those affecting young people, are reflected in the Army," I. Yefimov, assistant chief of the Main Political Directorate for the All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League, believes. "So it is no use blaming the mirror...."

Information from military districts:

"Before entering the Army, 25 percent of draftees have been detained by the militia, and 6 percent have convictions.... Some 125,000—12 times more than 20 years ago—do not know Russian.... Many have mastered the techniques for producing toxic substances, home-brewed beer, and moonshine from toothpaste, shoe polish, and glue. There has been an increase in the number of believers, of people who have not worked prior to the Army, and of people who are physically unprepared for service...."

The character of the draft contingent is not going to alter in the very near future. So, is the Army to blame?

"Killings and suicides, maiming because of irregular relationships and humiliation on ethnic grounds—this is what military service is like"—such slogans are not rare today. Not so long ago, fulfilling their voters' mandate, a group of Lithuanian Supreme Soviet deputies sent a request to the CPSU Central Committee, which also contained a question on the causes of death of young Lithuanian men in the Army. A USSR Defense Ministry commission provided the names of all the 90 people who have died over the past 10 years (not counting "afgantsy"). There is no link with geography: Most died precisely on the territory of the Baltic region. There were various causes of death, ranging from drunkenness and narcotic poisoning (incidentally, the district training unit receives remittances worth an average of R1.5 million a year. Does this money go only on candy?) to violation of safety techniques.

"We had just reassured the Lithuanians when Turkish newspapers reported: Guys of Turkish nationality are being killed in the Soviet Army," I was told at the Main Political Directorate. "The USSR Foreign Ministry and the Defense Ministry refute this. Then there are disturbances in Baku: Azerbaijani soldiers get killed. Again we vindicate ourselves—there are fatalities, but not because of interethnic quarrels. There are deaths on guard duty (particularly now that there has been a sharp increase in the number of attacks on sentries) and suicides. But take the statistics of those who have died in 'civvy street:' In some regions there are more deaths in one year than during the whole war in Afghanistan!"

All this does not mean that there is no problem. Legal guarantees of soldiers' protection from an arbitrary commander or from taunting by fellow servicemen are needed. But fear of service, in my opinion, is just one of the reasons. Another is that there is no prestige in serving today: "The Army is a school of life, but let others attend it...."

The Ukrainian Reserve Servicemen's Council conducted a questionnaire: Practically all the 100,000 "afgantsy" in the republic are children of workers, kolkhoz members, engineers, or teachers. Mindful of the USSR Supreme Soviet decision to release students from military service, I will venture to conjecture that the composition of the soldiery will not change in the immediate future. The extremely negative attitude of the majority of soldiers to the deputies' decision is understandable. It is not even that combat hardware has been left without crews, and ships, submarines, the Rocket Forces, and Air Defense Forces without their best cadres. In the end they have drafted rural machine operators and technical college graduates, and they will teach and train them—a simple matter!

"But mothers whose children have been left to serve would hardly put flowers on the table of the Supreme Soviet Presidium," I was told recently on board the cruiser "Kirov."

"Serving in the Army means losing two years, during which they also turn you into a half-wit," I have heard from draftees. Well, there are enough fools in the Army, just as there are everywhere. But why tar everyone with the same brush? I realize that few people today are interested in the fact that Rimskiy-Korsakov and Mussorgskiy, Krusenshtern, Tupolev, and Ilyushin were military men—it was long ago. You can hardly convince

people by telling them that the Army gives them a profession—it is clear that you will acquire the same skills in "civvy street", too.

The chief argument remains: There is the defense minister's order, there is the law. But the reply comes: "There are many laws and orders now, and the military commissariat will do nothing to us." It is true that it is practically safe to "hide" from service today. In Moscow, for example, just three people have been punished for violating the Law on Compulsory Military Service. Prosecutors brush soldiers aside. Here is a typical example: Officers of Oktyabrskiy Rayon Military Commissariat forwarded to Rayon Prosecutor N. Morozov a list of 53 people evading service. He refused to institute criminal proceedings. The reason? Precisely 28 people did not even come to the prosecutor's office, and the others excused themselves by saying that they did not know the law.

"The very active anti-Army agitation by informals is another cause of the situation that has come about," N. Akberdin, an officer of the Ground Forces Political Directorate, believes. "Many people seem to dislike the fact that the Army is united today and, despite everything, remains a real force."

What is the attitude of soldiers to all this? This conclusion has been drawn from the results of a study conducted by the Ministry of Defense and the Main Political Directorate: "The mood of a considerable section of officers is creating a crisis situation in the Army."

"People up above have realized that murmurings have arisen among the troops," one of the officers said to me. "Of course, the situation is far from critical, but you cannot change the situation just by increasing wages. Some officers have left, but others do not want to leave. They dislike the present attitude to the Army."

It should not be forgotten that soldiers differ from miners in that they have weapons.

What Lies Ahead?

But first, a question: Do we need an army at all—under conditions of peaceful coexistence?

"Are there any countries which do not have armed forces? Even lilliputian states have armies, albeit comic opera ones," I have heard repeatedly. "Yes, the world has 'grown warmer,' but full detente is a long way off."

The armed forces remain a guarantee of tranquillity in any state. It is not for nothing that people say: Whoever does not want to feed his own army feeds someone else's.

What kind of army is needed? Many people see the creation of professional, contract armed forces as a panacea. Not bad: We can put an end to the notorious bullying, to interethnic conflicts, to the unprofessionalism of officers, and to 100 other ills—and all with a single stroke!

Are we ready for this today? I personally have not encountered a well-reasoned, substantiated "yes." Europe continues to "cling" to compulsory military service. It is true that service times there are shorter, ranging from 1 year in Belgium to 16 months in the FRG. But a sensible combination has been found—posts that require good training are filled not by new recruits but by professional soldiers. We too have this—in the Rocket Forces, in the Navy, and in places in the Air Force. Why not go further? Why not abandon a number of units, leaving only combat units? Let us also think about reducing service times there....

National formations are being proposed, and demands to serve only on "one's own" territory are being heard. This is supported by the supreme soviets of some republics. And the Defense Ministry is going some way toward this—up to one-third of draftees already stay close to home. Is that too little? But what will we get by proclaiming the favorite slogan: "Give us 100 percent?" For example, the confrontation is continuing between Armenia and Azerbaijan—still involving the use of stolen weapons. So are we to create national divisions? The majority of draftees today come from Central Asia, but does this mean that our combat might must be concentrated there?

There will be many more arguments about what the Army should be like. But, in my view, it is already obvious today that an alternative service is needed. This will obviate the need to draft into the Armed Forces convicts and sick people who do not accept military service on ideological, religious, or other grounds. What prevents the introduction of compulsory labor service for them (for a long period, of course), as in the majority of countries? Cannot convicts work—without shoulder boards—in the national economy and on railroad construction, and those who are unfit for service on health grounds in homes for the elderly, boarding schools, and hospitals?

But, for the time being, a banal conclusion: It is necessary to observe the existing law.

"Of course, this does not mean that the law must not be revised," M. Klimov, chief of Moscow City Military Commissariat Political Department, believes. "Many of its provisions run counter to the recently adopted laws on cooperatives and the state enterprise (association). In addition, it is not the military commissariats that implement the draft into the Army, as many people think, but soviet power, which means, following logic, that it is not the defense minister but the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet who must issue the order on the draft and on transfer to the reserve. Only in this way can party and soviet organs locally be involved. The USSR Prosecutor's Office is accountable for oversight."

And again. I recall a phrase used by a draftee: "I do not want to join an army where brutish behavior takes the place of discipline and where drill rules." I am not calling for soldiers to be allowed home with their weapons on

their days off, as is done in Switzerland, for example—it is easy to imagine what that would lead to. But neither is it an argument for me that 80 percent of servicemen who currently go AWOL are serving close to home. Could we not ponder why this happens? Why are furlough and discharge a form of incentive for a soldier, and not a legal right?

In my notepad there are dozens of questions from people who will be serving tomorrow. Why is it so difficult to transfer someone who has come up against irregular relationships to another unit, or someone who is in poor health to another locality? Why not carry out the draft once a year or at least regularize it by "leaving" schoolchildren until the fall and letting them try for admission to a higher educational institution (since the decision on students has already been adopted)? Why not inform parents of the precise dates of discharge?

I know what the military's answer will be: That would weaken the Army's combat ability.

Perhaps, to some extent, that is so. But is it not being weakened by what is happening today?

Zaykov, Yazov Speak at Veterans' Collegium

LD0112232789 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 1 Dec 89

[Text] The Collegium of the USSR Ministry of Defense has examined the question of deepening of the work with the veterans of the army and the navy, and of improving the activity of veterans' organizations. Members of the Presidium of the All-Union Council of Veterans of War and Labor took part in the conversation. Much attention was devoted to tasks in connection with the preparation for the 45th anniversary of the victory in the Great Fatherland War. Comrades Zaykov and Yazov spoke at the sitting of the Collegium. Chuck, Did I do the "bullet-list" correctly???

Akhromeyev on Military Doctrine, Arms Control

90UM0108A Moscow ZA RUBEZHOM in Russian No 46, 10-16 Nov 89 pp 1-3

[Article by S. Akhromeyev, Marshall of the Soviet Union: "Our Military Doctrine"]

[Text] The new Soviet military doctrine went into effect in 1987. Its creation proceeded in parallel with the development of the basic provisions for restructuring, that is, the new domestic and foreign policy which serves as a foundation for the military doctrine.

In its foreign political activity the Soviet Union adheres to the principles of international relations outlined by M.S. Gorbachev in his speech at the United Nations. The main ones are: Demilitarization—the complete rejection of the application of force, of power politics; democratization—granting each country the right to participate as an equal with other countries in the discussion and resolution of all problems of international life; de-ideologization—the refusal to transfer ideological differences to relations among states, which should be built exclusively on principles of international law.

Considering peace on earth to be the major human value and taking into account the appreciable warming of the world political climate, the Soviet Union and put into effect a new military doctrine, as a result of which defense activities at various levels have come to dominate in our theory and practice.

The Soviet military doctrine is a system of officially adopted fundamental views on the prevention of war, military construction, the preparation of the country and the armed forces to repel aggression, and also the means of conducting an armed struggle to defend the socialist homeland. It is closely coordinated with the military doctrine of the Warsaw Pact states. Its main goal is to provide the Soviet people the possibility of socialist construction under the conditions of a stable peace.

The antimilitary direction and the strictly defensive nature of the military doctrine, which is based on the USSR Constitution, are embodied in its political and military-technical aspects.

The USSR, when determining its tasks in the area of providing for the security of the country and its Warsaw Pact allies, does not link the future to a military solution to international problems. The Soviet Union completely rejects war as a means of resolving international disputes and contradictions—economic, political, or ideological. Promoting war is forbidden by law in our country.

Speaking out in favor of resolving all international disputes peacefully, through political means, we think that under current conditions war has become completely obsolete as a means of achieving political ends and has become unacceptable and inadmissible.

The USSR threatens no one, does not intend to attack anyone, and will never enter on the path of aggression. It has no territorial claims against any state in the world; it does not relate as an enemy to any state or any people. The USSR is prepared along with all countries to build relations on the basis of mutual accounting for interests of security and peaceful coexistence. The Soviet Union will never under any circumstances be the first to begin military actions against any state unless it itself is the object of aggression or armed attack; it will never be the first to apply nuclear weapons.

At the same time the Soviet Union thinks that, although the immediate threat of a world war pushed back, the military danger for the USSR and its allies will remain until the changes in international relations become irreversible. This is confirmed both by the declarations of the leadership of the U.S. Administration and by their actions for further increasing their military strength. The strategy of "nuclear deterrent" and a "flexible reaction" to which the United States and its NATO allies adhere,

allows them to be the first to use nuclear weapons. They have not made the commitment not to be the first to begin military actions in general. U.S. Secretary of Defense R. Cheney, speaking on 13 September of this year at the Hudson Institute, said that the United States and its allies have no justification for changing their current strategy, which is based mainly on military might. The United States is continuing mass development of sea- and air-launched long-range cruise missiles with nuclear warheads and the introduction into their arsenal of more and more submarines with Trident-2 missiles, and they are continuing testing of heavy B-2 bombers with Stealth technology.

In providing for its security, the USSR strictly observes and intends to observe in the future all the commitments that ensue from the UN Charter, the Helsinki Final Act, the document of the Stockholm conference on measures for strengthening confidence, security, and disarmament in Europe, and also bilateral treaties and agreements between countries and generally recognized norms of international law.

Based on the fact that the currently existing balance of military forces is still the decisive factor in the prevention of war, our country is exerting and will continue to exert efforts to maintain it at an ever lower level. The states now have no other way of strengthening peace than reaching agreements on a sharp reduction of the level of military confrontation. We single out the following basic directions in the radical reduction of arms:

- Stage-by-stage reduction of strategic offensive arms of the USSR and the United States and other states, the refusal to permit the spread of the arms race to space. A complete ban on nuclear testing, production, and improvement of all nuclear weapons, and ultimately their complete elimination.
- Reduction of armed forces and conventional arms in Europe to the level at which no side, while providing for its own defense, will have means for a sudden attack on another side or for the development of offensive operations in general.
- The achievement of strict control over all disarmament measures based on a combination of national technical equipment and international procedures, including the creation of the corresponding international organs, the exchange of military information, and the conducting of inspections on the spot.
- The prohibition and elimination of chemical and other kinds of weapons for mass destruction.
- The creation in various regions of the world of zones that are free of nuclear and chemical weapons and also zones with reduced concentration of arms and increased confidence and the implementation of military measures of confidence in Europe on a mutual basis and agreement on similar measures in other regions of the world and also in the seas and oceans.
- Mutual refusal of states of the Warsaw Pact and the NATO bloc to apply military force and the adoption of commitments to maintain peaceful relations, eliminate military bases on the territories of other states, remove the most dangerous kinds of offensive weapons from the zone where the two alliances directly border on each other, and also reduce the concentration of armed forces to a minimum agreed-upon level in this zone.
- Considering the division of Europe into opposing military blocs to be an abnormal phenomenon, the USSR is in favor of a simultaneous disbandment of the North Atlantic alliance and the Warsaw Pact, and as a first step—the elimination of their military organizations and ultimately the creation of an all-encompassing system of international security.

Such is the content of the political side of the Soviet military doctrine. Now about the military and technical side.

When evaluating the nature of a possible armed conflict in the Soviet Union we proceed from the following:

—If armed aggression begins, it will evolve into a world war. Its consequences will be catastrophic not only for the sides at war but also for all of humankind. It cannot possibly be limited to the framework of a single region or theater of military operations. A nuclear war which begins as limited cannot be kept within certain bounds.

—Aggression undertaken with the application of conventional weapons can have principally different character from what it has had in past wars. Such a war will encompass a large part of the continents, oceans, seas, and atmosphere; combat activities will be accompanied by immense losses and destruction which exceed those of World War II many times over. Many modern conventional weapons systems, especially high-precision ones, are almost as effective as small nuclear weapons. In the war there will inevitably be destruction of nuclear energy facilities, chemical enterprises, nuclear ammunition and chemical weapon storage facilities, and there will be extensive zones of pollution, destruction, and flooding. Conventional war can grow into nuclear war at any moment.

—Under modern conditions armed regional conflicts and local wars are also dangerous. They can bring many states and nations into their orbits and grow into a war of a worldwide scale.

Taking into account that there is still a military danger for our country, we are preparing our armed forces for repelling aggression if it comes, and we are conducting our military construction in keeping with this. In the military and technical area of the doctrine we are considering important questions of the theory and practice of waging war and building up armed forces. There are four major ones.

First—the nature of the military threat and the probable opponent. As we know, we have not chosen the enemy. We are always hearing from the West that the main opponent of NATO is the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact as a whole. The military danger for us remains

because of the policy of a position of force with respect to us that is being adhered to by the United States and the North Atlantic bloc as a whole, with preparations in the United States for the creation of a system of anti-aircraft defense for the country and the refusal of the American administration to conducted negotiations concerning reduction of naval forces. Neither of the military alliances trusts the other. The powerful groupings of armed forces belonging to them are confronting one another in Europe. The United States and the USSR have accumulated an immense quantity of nuclear weapons.

But the USSR and the Warsaw Pact are taking real measures to remove the worries (real and imagined) of the peoples of the countries of Western Europe through their actions in the military area. People know of the decisions of the Warsaw Pact (they are already being implemented) to reduce armed forces. But the United States and their NATO allies far from always act in a similar way. The commander of the armed forces of the NATO bloc in Europe, American General Galvin expresses these doubts every week: Is the USSR really reducing its armed forces. We in the Soviet Union are convinced that it is necessary to continue to reduce armed forces on a mutual basis. We must not stir up fear but good will on both sides and also bilateral (and where possible, also unilateral) actions of the Warsaw Pact and NATO in the area of arms reduction.

Second—which aggression is to be repulsed, and for which war are the armed forces preparing. Here the selection was not made by us, since the USSR has solemnly announced that it would not be the first to apply nuclear weapons under any circumstances while the United States and their allies that they might be the first to use them. Their doctrines of "nuclear deterrence" and "flexible reaction," toward which we do not conceal our negative attitude, are based on this. They are impeding the reduction of military tension and the development of confidence among the countries. As long as the doctrine of "nuclear terror" is in force, the armies of the North Atlantic Alliance and the Warsaw Pact will have to prepare for war with the use of nuclear weapons. The NATO bloc must change its policy and strategy in this area. Of course, a radical reduction and then complete elimination of nuclear weapons is a complicated process. It takes time. But it is necessary. There is no other path to radical improvement of the world situation.

Third—which armed forces are necessary?

The question of strategic nuclear arms is being resolved between the Soviet Union and the United States. We are ready to reduce them by 50 percent, taking into account strict fulfillment of the ABM [antiballistic missile] Treaty as it was signed in 1972. The Soviet Union intends to have a minimum number of conventional armed forces which are necessary for reliable repulsion of possible aggression in keeping with the requirements of reasonable defense sufficiency. An example of this approach are our proposals concerning the composition of the armed forces of the two alliances in Europe after their reduction.

These proposals envision a radical reduction of armed forces. Suffice it to say that the reduction of the number of troops from each side is envisioned to be more than a million, and the number of tanks of the Warsaw Pact is to be reduced by a factor of three.

It is proposed that after the reductions by the agreed-upon deadlines, the armies of the Warsaw Pact and the North Atlantic Alliance have the following: personnel—1,350,000; aircraft from frontline (tactical) aviation—4,700; combat helicopters—1,900; tanks—20,000; artillery—21,000-22,000; and infantry combat trucks and armored personnel carriers—28,000 each.

Moreover, it is proposed that the structure of the armed forces of the two sides be made purely defensive. We are prepared to work this way in all other areas as well.

But the states of the NATO bloc will not agree to reduce the number of armed forces to the proposed level. Why? Perhaps it is in order to leave the structure of their armed forces the same as it is while changing the structure of the infantry of the Warsaw Pact—for the Warsaw Pact will be cutting more tanks, weapons, and armored personnel carriers. This makes one doubt the sincerity of the intentions of the NATO bloc.

Fourth—for what kinds of military actions must we prepare in order to repel aggression. I wish to emphasize: The Armed Forces of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact as a whole since 1987, taking into account the public alarm in Western Europe, has refrained from large-scale offensive operations when repulsing aggression. The high command and the army and navy are now learning to prepare for conducting defensive operations in order to repel aggression. The training of the high command and the army and navy is being conducted accordingly.

The structure of the armed forces is also being rearranged. The Soviet Union has begun to remove tank divisions and other forces from the territory of its allies. In 1989 three tank divisions and a number of other units of various sizes have been removed from the GDR and Hungary. The same number will be withdrawn in 1990.

In the infantry and tank divisions of the USSR and our allies we are reducing the number of tanks and increasing the number of antitank weapons; crossing and landing units and subdivisions are being reduced. These measures are being taken openly, including for representatives of the mass media in the West.

We should like for the public in Western countries to understand that our military defense doctrine is not a declaration of our intentions. It is a guideline for action. Chuck—I dont't think Chervov is Chief, General Staff. Moiseyev is. Chervov is Chief of a directorate.

Chervov Interviewed on Defense Sufficiency

90UM0130A Moscow TRUD in Russian
24 Nov 89 p 3

[Report on interview with Colonel General N.F. Chervov, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, by Colonel V. Morozov: "The Doctrine of Reasonable Defense Sufficiency"; date and place not specified]

[Text] At the request of the editorial office, TRUD military observer Colonel V. Morozov met with the USSR Armed Forces Chief of General Staff Colonel General N.F. Chervov and asked him to answer questions associated with the features of the USSR's present-day military doctrine.

[Morozov] It is common knowledge that the NATO countries have agreed to a proposal from the Warsaw Pact member states concerning a comparison of military doctrines. What can you tell us about this?

[Chervov] Yes, there is such an agreement. At the talks in Vienna the representatives of 35 European states and the United States and Canada agreed to hold a seminar on military doctrines from 16 January to 5 February 1990. The level of those attending the seminar has not yet been finally decided, but all expressed themselves in favor of participation by chiefs of general staffs.

[Morozov] Why is so much attention now being paid to military doctrines?

[Chervov] Under present-day conditions, which are associated with profound changes in the sphere of international relations, great importance attaches to a correct understanding by states and alliances of states of the nature and thrust of each other's activity and their attitudes toward the basic issues of war and peace. These and other issues are reflected in military doctrines. And so in recent years the world community has also been paying particular attention to military doctrines.

[Morozov] In the West they still often distort the essential nature of Soviet military doctrine, ascribing to it an exceptionally aggressive nature. Others say that they see positive changes in our doctrine in the sense that a defensive character is being imparted to it. But all of this supposedly relates only to the political aspect of the doctrine. And so, they say, in the military-technical field the principle of reasonable sufficiency is still not being fully observed....

[Chervov] None of those assessments reflect the real essence of Soviet military doctrine.

The basis of our doctrine is USSR foreign policy, whose main task is to ensure for the Soviet people an opportunity to resolve the task of the building of socialism under conditions of a stable peace.

What content do we impart to the political aspect of Soviet military doctrine? The obligation of the USSR never under any circumstances to initiate actions against any state of we ourselves have not been the victims of aggression. We shall never be the first to use nuclear weapons. The USSR entertains no territorial claims and it regards no state or people as an enemy. We are ready to build our relations with all countries on the basis of mutual consideration of security interests and peaceful coexistence.

The political and the military-technical aspects of present-day doctrine are aligned, and the military-technical aspect is subordinated to the political aspect. They both have a unified defensive thrust. This is reflected in the main goal that we have set ourselves, namely, to prevent war. The prevention of war is the highest goal, the nucleus of the doctrine, and the main function of the Soviet state and its Armed Forces.

The defensive nature of Soviet doctrine is seen not only in our political obligations but also in the general thrust of military development and military planning, in training for the Armed Forces, and in all our practical affairs.

[Morozov] But if we talk more specifically about the content of the military-technical aspect of our doctrine, what should first be singled out?

[Chervov] The military-technical aspect includes primarily questions of defensive equipment for the USSR Armed Forces, their training, and determining the forms and methods for repulsing possible aggression. It has to do with at least four groups of issues.

The first is connected with the nature of the military threat for the USSR. Who is a potential enemy? Both sides—the USSR and the United States and the Warsaw Pact and NATO—deny that any threat emanates from them. At the same time, despite the major positive shifts that have taken place in the world, the leaders of the United States and NATO have still not removed from the agenda the notorious "Soviet military threat." Evidently we shall not be able to ignore this in our practical activity.

Second, despite the public statements about its "defensive" nature, the military doctrine of the United States and NATO still assumes the use of nuclear weapons in war. The United States has not abandoned the possibility of being the first to use nuclear weapons. This is written into the American combat regulations.

Why is it that the United States, and also France and Britain, are reluctant to assume an obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons? Does this weaken their power of deterrence? We are convinced that now, under the new conditions, the nuclear countries could assume this mutual obligation. The USSR also favors an obligation not to be the first to use conventional weapons in a war.

Third, great importance attaches to the question of what armed forces are needed to repulse an aggressor. Here we proceed from the principle of reasonable sufficiency for defense. What does this mean?

With respect to strategic offensive arms this principle means a balance of such arms between the USSR and the United States. Their structure may be different but the potential capabilities at any level of reduction should be balanced in terms of effectiveness of use.

For conventional armed forces, defensive sufficiency means those combat personnel with which the sides are capable of repulsing possible aggression, but at the same time do not threaten each other and do not have the capability of engaging in offensive actions. This means the following: Imparting a non- offensive character to armed forces; limiting personnel for strike systems; altering the grouping of armed forces and their deployment giving due consideration to defensive missions; and reducing the scales of military production.

Our proposals at the Vienna talks on the composition of the armed forces of the two alliances in Europe after they have been reduced are aimed at realizing the principle of reasonable sufficiency. These proposals provide for radical reductions in the armed forces of each side by more than 1 million men. After the armies of the Warsaw Pact and NATO have been reduced there would have the same numbers of personnel and weapons and their structure would be made purely defensive.

The fourth group of issues is connected with the methods of military actions for which the Soviet Armed Forces should be trained in order to repulse aggression. We have never prepared to be the first to unleash war. But, relying on our experience in World War II, until recently we did plan to repulse an aggressor by employing both defensive and offensive actions. Today we have reviewed our own strategy and changes have taken place in the thinking of the generals and officers. In the event of aggression, the main methods for combat actions by the Soviet Armed Forces in the event of war will be defensive.

[Morozov] Can you give specific examples of the realization of present-day Soviet military doctrine in our defense development?

[Chervov] There are many examples. Let me cite a few.

By 1 January 1991 we shall have reduced our Armed Forces by 500,000 men, 10,000 tanks, 8,500 artillery pieces, and 820 combat aircraft. Reductions of 235,500 have already been made. In addition, in accordance with a USSR Supreme Soviet decree, more than 172,000 students have been released. Some 7,120 tanks, more than 3,000 artillery systems, 735 combat aircraft and 40 ships have already been withdrawn from the combat inventory.

More than 50,000 men, about 3,200 tanks, and large quantities of other weapons and equipment have been withdrawn from the composition of Soviet troops deployed abroad. Three of the six tank divisions planned for withdrawal from the territory of allies have been withdrawn. The rest will be withdrawn in 1990. All the tanks divisions being withdrawn are being disbanded. Simultaneously, one air division, two air regiments, two independent helicopter detachments and a helicopter squadron, and also 29 other formations and units, are being withdrawn from the groups of forces.

Qualitative transformations are taking place in the structure of the Armed Forces. The numbers of military districts, armies, and combined-arms divisions are being reduced. Strike maneuver groups and the so-called "tank concentrated attack forces" are being liquidated. The divisions still remaining on the territory of our allies are being reformed. Some 40 percent of tanks (from 260 to 255) and 20 percent of tank units (from 320 to 250) are being withdrawn from the motorized rifle divisions. The divisions are being made defensive in nature.

Thanks to the positive changes in Europe and the further improvement of relations between the USSR and the northern countries (Finland, Sweden, Norway) it has been possible to reduce combat personnel and the numbers of Soviet troops in the northwest of the country. In particular, in the Leningrad Military District the number of tanks has been reduced by a factor of two. By early 1991 the grouping of forces in the Leningrad and Baltic districts will have been reduced by about one-third (by 40,000 men and 1,200 tanks) and large quantities of artillery).

By the end of 1989 some 500 tactical nuclear weapons (166 airborne, 284 missiles and 50 artillery pieces) will have been withdrawn from the territory of allies. Before the end of 1990 all nuclear-armed submarines will have been withdrawn from the Baltic Sea. We shall also destroy the warheads of nuclear missiles earmarked for those submarines.

We are halting the production of chemical weapons and starting to destroy existing stockpiles. We have ceased production of highly enriched uranium for military purposes. In 1989-1990 we shall be closing down two industrial reactors that process weapons-grade plutonium, without commissioning new capacities to replace them. Another one of those reactors was shut down two years ago. Our military budget will be reduced by more than 14 percent over the next two years (by R10 billion), including more than eight percent this year. And by 1995 we shall have reduced all defense spending in national income by a factor of 1.5 to 2.

The USSR is boldly initiating unconventional and innovative approaches to disarmament issues. We are opposing the unhealthy and danger psychology of confrontation with the logic of reason, goodwill, and constructive dialogue.

Unfortunately, we do not see tangible reciprocal practical steps by the United States and NATO. Sometimes we even see the reverse: The Warsaw Pact is unilaterally reducing its armed forces and making their structure non-offensive, while the NATO countries are planning "up-arming" and are not showing a readiness to hold talks on reducing navies and tactical nuclear weapons.

I would like to emphasize most definitely that we must work together to remove our mutual concerns. The present situation dictates the need for both sides to have well-considered relations not only in the political, but also the military sphere. In this connection we welcome the upcoming seminar in Vienna, during the course of which it will be possible to make a thorough comparison of military doctrines and concepts, remove mutual suspicion and mistrust, and seek out ways to accelerate the disarmament process.

IZVESTIYA Interviews Military Censor

PM3011154189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 2

[Interview with Major General S. Filimonov, chief of the USSR Armed Forces Main Military Censorship Office, by own correspondent V. Litovkin under the rubric "From Competent Sources": "Military Censorship: What Is Permitted and What Is Not"—date and place unspecified; first two paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] The old detached building in Kropotkinskaya Street is well known to journalists who write on army themes. The governor general of Moscow lived here once, then it housed the Institute for Daughters of the Nobility, and, after the revolution, it became the Worker-Peasant Red Army Military Academy. Today it is the editorial office of military journals and the USSR Armed Forces Main Military Censorship Office.

Our correspondent talked to its chief, Major General S. Filimonov.

[Litovkin] Sergey Alekseyevich, this is the first time a journalist has interviewed a chief military censor. Perhaps we could start with the question: What exactly is military censorship? What kind of tasks does it have?

[Filimonov] The military censorship as an organization is a subdivision of the General Staff. It was founded in 1918 on direct instructions from V.I. Lenin. As a form of activity, it is a component part of comprehensive statewide measures to ensure that state and military secrets and other information which could harm the defense capability of the country and the USSR Armed Forces are kept secret in open sources of information.

[Litovkin] Forgive me, but does your work not seem anachronistic in the era of perestroyka, glasnost, and growing openness in our society? The USSR Supreme Soviet is currently discussing a draft Law on the Press which states: Censorship is not permitted.

[Filimonov] You should not see me and my colleagues as hoary old retrogrades. I wholeheartedly welcome glasnost and openness. But.... Let us discuss this together.

Every state and every army has its secrets—regardless of the ideology which prevails in them. Economic, scientific and technical, commercial, and military secrets.... These secrets have to have legal protection, which is enshrined in the legislation of any highly developed country. Including the United States, Britain, the FRG, and other NATO countries. I think that total openness is a myth. The question, therefore, is concerned with a different aspect: Who should be responsible for preserving secrets—special bodies or journalists, editors, and publishers? Let our people's deputies decide. But I believe that it is better to prevent secrets from leaking out than to call people to account after the event.

[Litovkin] But many countries—including those you mentioned—have officially renounced censorship. Military censorship included.

[Filimonov] That is not quite true. Even if some countries do not have preliminary censorship, it does not mean that secret information is published with total freedom in the press. Any firm with any reputation at all, particularly firms associated with the military industry, has permanent staff who closely monitor the preservation of production secrets and other secrets.

What is more, special state bodies and commissions monitor publications. In the United States, for example, the Pentagon and the CIA have control functions. The penalties for leaking secrets are extremely harsh.

[Litovkin] I do not doubt that state and military secrets need to be protected. But does military censorship not also intrude into areas which do not appear to be the subject of state secrets, even when information about them is widely available? I still remember with shame the totally just criticism leveled against journalists by our servicemen in Afghanistan: There is a real war going on, they said, people are dying, but you just write about tactical maneuvers in the mountains. Was it not both distressing and ridiculous to read that they had been made Heroes of the Soviet Union "for successes in combat and political training"? What about the problem of nonregulation relations? Only now has this begun to be talked about openly. Have we not neglected this evil simply because we were forbidden to write about it?

[Filimonov] This criticism is bitter to hear but fair nevertheless. We self-critically accept part of the blame for what happened. Why only part? Because the military censorship does not impose any restrictions itself. It simply carries out instructions from the country's political and military leadership and central departments and institutions.

The absurdity of prohibiting discussion of the combat operations in Afghanistan is now obvious. The whole of the world's press was writing about them and every radio station was carrying broadcasts on the subject—including broadcasts to our country, of course. Rumors about tens and hundreds of thousands of dead sprang up and multiplied. Especially as zinc coffins began to arrive in the families of our people. But journalists were not allowed to tell the truth.

But those were the directives of the time. We were obliged to comply with them.

Since 1985, everything has been written about the Afghan war. The army and its number have been named and its size given. The total number of casualties and the number of wounded and those taken prisoner have been published. You journalists, writers, historians, and researchers have to reconstruct the full truth about those years. We promise you support and assistance in this noble task.

As far as bullying is concerned, allow me to remind you of just one fact. Back in July 1973, the newspaper of the Southern Group of Forces, LENINSKOYE ZNAMYA, for which you were working at the time, published a piece entitled "Degrees of Degradation." It was about barracks hooliganism and those very same nonregulation relations everyone is talking about today. I know that Colonel Aleksey Alekseyevich Kolosov, a military censor, helped to get it published. This is far from being an isolated example.

[Litovkin] Yes, but the senior editor was reprimanded at the time for publishing the piece.

[Filimonov] The military censor had nothing to do with this. Although it is certainly true that we tried to avoid generalizations and did not speak about bullying as a phenomenon and an ill against which we should all wage a resolute struggle. That is how it was. I hope that that time is now gone forever.

[Litovkin] But how can a real barrier be created if restrictions are still imposed by departments? We cannot rule out the possibility—and our newspaper has already written about this—that they will be guided not by state interests in this respect but by group egoism and a desire to conceal shoddy work behind a veil of secrecy.

[Filimonov] That danger certainly does exist. In my view, a law on state secrets could put an end to departmentalism. The adoption of such a law would remove many misunderstandings and make our work a lot easier.

[Litovkin] So, as far as you are concerned, military censorship work is undergoing renewal. How is this expressed? How many restrictions have been lifted recently?

[Filimonov] It is easier to talk about what is still closed to the press than about what is permitted. I do not think it is a question of figures. The most important point is that the press is now allowed to publish what it has never been allowed to publish before.

[Litovkin] What kind of subjects are considered undesirable for publication?

[Filimonov] Information constituting a military secret. This includes information on the deployment of units and formations, although more than 150 garrisons are open to the press. It is not permitted to disclose the staff structure and organization of troops, certain questions concerning combat readiness, or secret prototypes of arms and military hardware.... Although even here there are numerous exceptions.

The openness of the Soviet Armed Forces is now unparalleled. This is, of course, the result of the new political thinking and the changes in the international arena. The result of the perestroyka which is taking place in the Army and Navy.

I will not remind you of interstate agreements or the mutual verification and inspections between NATO and the Warsaw Pact. Readers are aware of how they are scrupulously fulfilled. Cases where foreign correspondents have visited Soviet military units are also well known. Soviet journalists have not been left out in the cold either. They have visited the command posts of all branches of the Armed Forces, seen the very latest arms and hardware, and written about them. IZVESTIYA correspondents have "penetrated" the inner sanctum—the Central Command Post of the General Staff—and written a report on its duty shift in NEDELYA....

Many restrictions concerning the military budget and the combat and numerical composition of the Armed Forces were lifted quite recently. Information on all incidents, accidents, and disasters, cases of draft-dodging, crimes, and even the theft of weapons and ammunition is published promptly. As well as on some other topics once considered "undesirable."

There is complete scope for initiative as far as the possibilities for writing about modern combat hardware are concerned. You may choose whatever interests you. The Su-25 ground attack aircraft, the Su-27 interceptor, which has created a furor in the skies of France, Britain, and Canada. You may write about the MiG-29 and the MiG-31, both remarkable machines. Or the Tu-160 long-range bomber. The Yak-38 deck aircraft. The Mi-24 helicopter gunship.

Or the T-72 and BMP-2 tanks. Nuclear submarines. The "Kirov" and "Frunze" nuclear cruisers, the "Baku" and "Novorossiysk" aircraft-carrying ships.... Many of these, incidentally, have been visited by your colleagues.

[Litovkin] Despite all this, Sergey Alekseyevich, we journalists still have problems in our relations with your department. A colleague of mine was recently prevented from naming the airfield near Baku from which an Il-76 military transport aircraft which subsequently crashed originally took off. But what was the point of this? The airfield cannot be hidden, it is perfectly visible from outer space....

[Filimonov] There is nothing you can do about this. This airfield must not be named in the press. Let us not entertain illusions: For all our openness, what is still forbidden is forbidden. That is all there is to it. [Filimonov ends]

The day before this conversation was published, I went back to the building in Kropotkinskaya Street to clarify details and check the text. Major General S. Filimonov read it carefully, made his amendments, and signed it. I could go ahead and send it to print.

Defense Society Alters Name To Reflect Change

LD0212125389 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 2 Dec 89

[Text] A plenum of the Voluntary Society for the Promotion of the Army, Aviation and Navy [DOSAAF] Central Committee today discussed the need for a fundamental restructuring of the activities of this defense society and the conformity of its work with the spirit and trends of the times. Its participants noted that the many negative phenomena that occur in this society are engendered by its excessive centralization and overorganization.

In this connection, it was concluded that the present name does not fully reflect the society's role and place in the life of the country. It was deemed desirable to change the DOSAAF of the USSR into the Union of Societies and Organizations Promoting the Defense of the State [Soyuz Obshchestv i Organizatsiy Sodeystvuyushchikh Oborone gosudarstva]. The plenum also considered the forthcoming elections and approved the platform of members of the defense society.

Leaders Sign Obituary of Retired Gen Agafonov

PM0112104389 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 29 Nov 89 First Edition p 4

[Obituary of A.N. Agafonov]

[Excerpts] Colonel General (Retired) Aleksey Nikolayevich Agafonov, an eminent political worker in the Soviet Armed Forces, has died aged 68 after a serious illness. He devoted his entire life to selfless service of the Soviet people and the Communist Party, which he joined in 1942. [Passage omitted]

From 1975 through 1984 he worked at the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate as deputy chief of the Organizational Party Work Directorate and chief of the Cadres Directorate. From 1984 through this January he was chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff Political Department. [Passage omitted]

[Signed] D.T. Yazov, M.A. Moiseyev, P.G. Lushev, K.A. Kochetov, A.D. Lizichev, Yu.P. Maksimov, V.I. Varennikov, I.M. Tretyak, A.N. Yefimov, V.N. Chernavin, M.I. Sorokin, V.M. Arkhipov, V.M. Shabanov, N.V. Chekov, V.L. Govorov, D.S. Sukhorukov, Yu.A. Yashin, A.I. Sorokin. N.I. Shlyaga, B.A. Omelichev, V.N. Lobov, A.N. Kleymenov, V.G. Denisov, G.F. Krivosheyev, V.I. Grebenyuk, G.A. Stefanovskiy, A.I. Maslov, I.A. Larin, A.I. Shirinkin, V.V. Korobushin.